

BK

5995

P3 H3



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 566 671 4

BX 5995
.P3 H3
Copy 1

A New Bishop and a New Era in the Diocese of Maryland.

A SERMON

PREACHED

IN ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, HOWARD COUNTY, MARYLAND,
ON NOV. 2, 1884,

BEING THE SUNDAY FOLLOWING THE ELECTION TO
THE EPISCOPATE OF MARYLAND OF

THE REV. WILLIAM PARET, D. D.

WITH A PREFACE ON RECENT CHURCH CONTROVERSIES.

BY

THE REV. HALL HARRISON, M. A.

NEW YORK:
T. WHITTAKER, PUBLISHER,
2 and 3 Bible House.

BALTIMORE:
GEORGE LYCETT,
40 Lexington St.

1884.

Price Ten Cents.



PRESS OF ISAAC FRIEDENWALD,
BALTIMORE, MD.

BX5995
P3H3

TO

THE REV. WILLIAM KIRKUS, M. A., LL. B.,

EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN LITERARY CHURCHMAN,

WHOSE VIGOROUS AND FEARLESS PEN

HELPED US TO RECOVER FOR OUR DIOCESE

THE SUPREMACY OF LAW AND FREEDOM OF DISCUSSION,

THIS SERMON

IS RESPECTFULLY INSCRIBED

WITH SENTIMENTS OF AFFECTIONATE REGARD.

FROM MR. GLADSTONE'S CELEBRATED ESSAY,
"THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AND RITUALISM."

"Ritualism surely means an undue disposition to ritual. Ritual itself is founded on the Apostolic precept, 'Let all things be done decently and in order,' . . . [According to a use of the term which in practice is more widely prevalent than any other.] Ritualism is to each man that which, in matter of ritual, each man dislikes, and holds to be in excess. When the term is thus used it becomes in the highest degree deceptive; for it covers, under an apparent unity, meanings as many as the ripples of the smiling sea; as the shades of antagonism to, or divergence from, the most overloaded Roman ceremonial. When the term is thus employed, sympathy flies, as if it were electricity, through the crowd; but it is sympathy based upon the sound and not upon the sense. Men thus impelled, mischievously, but naturally, mistake the strength of their feeling for the strength of their argument. The heated mind resents the chill touch and relentless scrutiny of logic. . . .

"RITUAL, THEN, IS THE CLOTHING WHICH, IN SOME FORM AND IN SOME DEGREE, MEN NATURALLY AND INEVITABLY GIVE TO THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PUBLIC DUTIES OF RELIGION." . . . [After some valuable remarks on the adaptation of the outward to the inward, on bad architecture, on æsthetics, and on the visible improvement in the public taste, Mr. Gladstone thus proceeds:]

"What is Ritualism? It is unwise, undisciplined reaction from poverty, from coldness, from barrenness, from nakedness; it is overlaying purpose with adventitious and obstructive incumbrance; it is departure from measure and from

harmony in the annexation of appearance to substance, of the outward to the inward; *it is the caricature of the beautiful; it is the conversion of helps into hindrances; it is the attempted substitution of the secondary for the primary aim*, and the real failure and paralysis of both. A great deal of our architecture, a great share of our industrial production, has been or is, it may be feared, very ritualistic indeed. . . .

“It must be admitted that the state of things, from which the thing popularly known as ritualism took historically its point of departure, was dishonoring to Christianity, disgraceful to the nation, disgraceful most of all to that much vaunted religious sentiment of the English public, which in impenetrable somnolence endured it and resented all interference with it. Nakedness enough there was, fifty and forty years ago, of divine service and of religious edifices among the Presbyterians of Scotland and among the Nonconformists of England. But, among these, the outward fault was to a great extent redeemed by the cardinal virtues of earnestness and fervour. The prayer of the minister was at least listened to with a pious attention, and the noblest of all the sounds that can reach the human ear was usually heard in the massive swell and solemn fall of the united voices of the congregations.

“But within the ordinary English Parish Church of town or country, [and the remark applies also to America, with certain obvious qualifications] there was no such redeeming feature in the action of the living, though the inanimate treasure of the Prayer Book yet remained. Its warmth was stored, like the material of fire in our coal seams, for better days. It was still the surviving bed or mould in which higher forms of religious thought and feeling were some day to be cast. But the actual state of things, as to worship, was bad beyond all parallel known to me in experience or reading. Taking together the expulsion of the poor and laboring classes (especially from the town churches), the mutilations and blockages of the fabrics, the baldness of the service, the

VII

elaborate horrors of the so-called music, with the jargon of parts contrived to exhibit the powers of every village roarer, and to prevent all congregational singing, and above all, the coldness and indifference of the lounging or sleeping congregations, our services were probably without a parallel in the world for their debasement. As they would have shocked a Brahmin or a Buddhist, so they hardly could have been endured in this country had not the faculty of taste and the perception of the seemly or unseemly been as dead as the spirit of devotion."—Gladstone's *Gleanings of Past Years*, vol. VI, pp. 109, etc.

CONTENTS OF THE PREFACE.

	PAGE
1. Peculiar importance of Dr. Paret's election,	ix
2. Origin of the late controversies,	ix
NOTE.—May a "Standing Committee" be criticized?	
3. Statement of the question at issue,	xii
4. Position of the Bishop-elect on that question. His Letter to Dr. Grammer,	xiii
(a) Bitterness of party-spirit in Maryland,	xiv
(b) What are the rights of a parish and rector?	xiv
(c) Discourtesy and usurpation of the Standing Committee,	xv
(d) Fair dealing demanded. Dr. Paret no "Ritualist,"	xv
5. Justice and generosity of this Letter,	xv
6. The Standing Committee compelled to give way,	xvi
7. Conversion of Dr. Lewin,	xvi
8. What is the net result?	xvi
9. Ritualism not swept away,	xvi
10. The "symbolic dolphins" at Emmanuel,	xvii
11. Drs. Paret and Hodges kept out of the Standing Committee and General Convention,	xviii
12. Charge of the Bishop of London. "Be at peace,"	xix-xxii

PREFACE.

1. The election of the Rev. DR. PARET to the Episcopate of Maryland is, from every point of view, an event of no little importance. It gives promise that we have at length seen the end of the late unhappy and discouraging condition of affairs, which has excited the amazement and regret of more peaceful Dioceses. In some of these there has been ritual far more extravagant and striking than has ever been known in Baltimore, but it has excited no panic or alarm that has not speedily subsided.

The time seems to have come for a calm review of the past and a summing up of results. Every Diocese is interested in this question.

2. The lamentable state of things to which I refer grew out of a now admitted misconstruction, on the part of our Standing Committee,* of the

* In 1879 the Standing Committee of Maryland was composed as follows : The Rev. S. R. Gordon, D. D., *President* ; the Rev. A. P. Stryker, *Secretary* ; the Rev. John H. Chew, and the Rev. Drs. Leeds, Lewin, Elliott, and Hoff. When Dr. Hoff died the Committee filled the vacancy (notwithstanding a strong and indignant protest from the AMERICAN LITERARY CHURCHMAN) by electing the Rev. A. M. Randolph, D. D., of Emmanuel Church. When this gentleman was chosen Assistant Bishop of Virginia, the Rev. Dr. Hutton, one of our oldest and most trusted presbyters, was

Canons on Ordination. Their view has been proved to be bad law—never before heard of; and such as it was, it was applied with an injustice and discourtesy which it would be painful to recall with any farther particularity. I allude of course to the cases of Messrs. W. D. Martin and H. C. Bishop, and to the correspondence that was published. In

put, by the Committee, in his place, and when the lamented Dr. Gordon died in 1883, Dr. W. W. Williams, a conservative churchman, who is no partisan, was chosen to succeed him. The Committee, as thus re-constituted, was re-elected in 1884 with scarcely any opposition. The criticisms which follow in these pages apply, of course, exclusively to the old Standing Committee of 1879, 1880, 1881 and 1882, and only to the *majority* of that Committee. There was always a minority of one, two, or three that counselled, ineffectually, the things that made for peace. Owing, however, to the miserable system of secrecy regarding the affairs of the Committee (and that only half maintained), it was impossible to say with absolute certainty who the minority were. That there was always an opposing minority on these troublesome questions, the Rev. Mr. Chew stated in open Convention in 1882.

And here it may, perhaps, be well to add a word about the right and propriety of criticizing such a body as the "Standing Committee." It was actually maintained here in Maryland, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, that the Standing Committee being a sort of "ecclesiastical authority," was above criticism; that their persons were sacred; such a divinity did hedge them round that, as in the case of royalty, 'twas treason to question the legality or propriety of their acts—you could turn them out of office, but you must never dare to *say why* you wish to do it, etc.! This is such sheer nonsense as hardly needs serious refutation. The Standing Committee by

Mr. W. R. Webb's case the letter of the law was indeed observed, but his examiners (two of whom, with questionable propriety, were also members of the Standing Committee, and therefore sat on the poor young man *twice*) treated him with needless severity, and, I regret to add, an apparent spirit

no means occupy the position of a Bishop (and even a Bishop is subject to impeachment and trial, as the Rev. Dr. Randolph took pains in 1875 to keep us Marylanders from forgetting). The members of the Standing Committee are elected annually by the Convention. They are essentially a *committee*—the “Executive Committee”—of the Diocese, the *servants* of the Convention; and like other servants, even in these degenerate days, are liable to be dismissed if they are not “satisfactory.” They are appointed to do certain duties which are carefully laid down by law, and they are answerable to public opinion and to the Convention. If they neglect their duties, if they violate the law, if they strain and stretch it, if they show favoritism, or are discourteous and unwise, it is not only a right, but a duty, to call them to account, both in and out of Convention, and to endeavor to awaken a public opinion which will either cause them to behave, or else replace them with better and wiser men. (This duty the AMERICAN LITERARY CHURCHMAN undertook, and very successfully performed.) In short, while the Bishop may be likened to the King, and should be treated with a sort of loyal allegiance and deference—even his mistakes handled as tenderly as possible; the Standing Committee may be compared to the “Ministry,” for the time being, in the English Constitution. Like the ministry, its members are subject to the honest criticism and judgment of those who made, and can, if they see fit to do so, also unmake them. In Church matters, as in politics, free discussion is indispensable, and it is never feared except by those whose deeds will not bear exposure to the light of day.

of *evasion* and unfairness, as the printed correspondence too plainly showed.* So utterly frivolous were the Maryland objections deemed, when investigated, that Bishop Neely ordained Mr. Martin, Bishop Doane ordained Mr. Bishop, and Bishop Henry Potter ordained Mr. Webb. The deliberate judgments of these Bishops and their Standing Committees will probably carry as much weight with the Church at large as the judgment of Dr. Lewin and the three or four gentlemen of the Maryland Committee who joined him on this issue.

3. It may be well to re-state the question in debate, and the attitude of the Committee.

Ever since Standing Committees have existed, the following has been the unvarying custom in the Church, down to the cases of Messrs. Martin and Bishop. When testimonials duly signed by a Rector and Vestry "in good standing" are presented, the Standing Committee accept the candidate, as a

*The Editor of the AMERICAN LITERARY CHURCHMAN, who so mercilessly exposed all these doings and helped to bring about the "new era," appended the following brief remarks to the letters as published in his paper :

"We commend this correspondence to intelligent laymen. Will they ask themselves how far they would have been satisfied with this kind of treatment if their own sons had been subjected to it?" These batches of correspondence, quite unique in their way, *set people to thinking*. A laughable climax of absurdity, moreover, was reached when a correspondent in the AMERICAN LITERARY CHURCHMAN proved from Bishop Whittingham's published writings that that prelate could not have passed a satisfactory examination in divinity before Dr. Lewin and his associates! Of course, then, Mr. Webb could not.

matter of course, unless they *know*, either personally or from satisfactory evidence, that he is unfit—"know him to be a bad man"—as our great canonist Dr. Hawks expresses it.* In such a case it would be manifest that the Rector and Vestry had been imposed upon, and it would be the duty of the Committee to reject. It was never heard of until Mr. Martin's case, that a Standing Committee could reject a man whom they knew and admitted to be fit and good, and prevent him even from *beginning* his theological studies, because they disapproved the opinions, or "churchmanship," of the *Rector* who signed his papers. Yet this was what the Maryland Committee claimed and did.

Under these canons High Church Committees have always received candidates from Low Church congregations, and *vice versa*. Nor is there the least danger of the Church suffering, because the same canons provide that the acquirements and orthodoxy of the candidate shall be determined after *searching examinations, not by the Standing Committee, but by the Examining Chaplains and Bishop*. The Committee's functions are entirely distinct.†

4. The position taken on this important and

* Hawks on "Constitution and Canons," p. 192, Edit. 1841.

† The Maryland Committee is a witness against itself. That same committee had received the testimonials of H. Chew Bishop as "satisfactory" in 1878, though they must have been signed by those same clergy who were even then "under the ban," as the *Baltimore American* very properly termed it. *Vide Journal of Maryland Convention for 1879.*

critical question by the Bishop-elect (who was never classed as a "Ritualist"), and of others who resisted the encroachments of the Committee and their discourteous and unwise methods, was forcibly expressed at the time in his letter to the Rev. Julius E. Grammer, D.D.* A few extracts from this important and able document will be read with interest, both in and out of the Diocese, and they will be found fully to justify the ground taken in the sermon which follows:

(a) *My Dear Doctor* :—I am much obliged by your frank letter. It was a sense of deep discouragement that sent me on my poor effort to help for peace. And I confess I am more disheartened every day. It seems to me that in this Diocese the separation of parties is more marked, more bitter, and more persistent, than I have ever known it elsewhere. How our mission work, or any joint work, can thrive, or how there can be any sincerity and reality in the talk about unity, I cannot understand. [All this was perfectly true of the Diocese in those sad days; now, happily, much changed.] You ask my further opinion upon certain points.

(b) granting the right of the Standing Committee to refuse, you ask, What are the rights of the parish and rector testifying, and of the applicant? My answer is, first, as already suggested, COURTEOUS TREATMENT; and, second, a right to equal standing with others as qualified to testify, until, by *competent authority*, it has been decided otherwise. . . . [Dr. Paret then explains what he means by competent authority. He calls attention to the Canon on Ritual and the provision made for trying clergymen accused of violating it. After showing that no steps had been taken to try the Mount Calvary clergy or Dr. Hodges, Dr. Paret thus continues:] Now no right is more sacred, nor more carefully assured, than the right of fair hearing before judgment.

* See Baltimore *Church News* of June 17th, 1880.

But, in this instance, every provision, so carefully made, for fair hearing to those accused, is annulled by the Standing Committee.

(c) They have *usurped* a power of judgment and condemnation, without a hearing, without the investigation which the canon commands. On rumor, and *ex parte* statements, virtually refusing all opportunity to be heard, they have adjudged a certain parish and its rector so disloyal to the Church, that its testimonials are not to be received as sufficient. And when the parish and rector repeatedly ask reasons, they are repeatedly put off with discourtesy and snubbed. . . .

(d) I plead only for fair dealing, and an *equal* application of the law. You well know that I neither practice nor approve the things forbidden in the Canon referred to. In all matters of ritual and doctrine I am a plain old-fashioned churchman. But I am plain and old-fashioned also in my ideas of justice and fair treatment; and I do not think *error will ever be corrected by oppression.**

5. I should like to quote still further from this admirable letter, but this is enough to show its

* I may here mention an anecdote told me during the late Convention by one of the clergy of the City of Washington. My informant was conversing about Maryland, this past summer, with a Bishop whose name I do not feel at liberty to mention, but who would certainly be regarded as a prominent—possibly the most prominent—leader of the Evangelical School. “They will hardly elect Dr. Paret in Maryland,” said the Bishop, “he’s a *Ritualist*, isn’t he?” My friend informed the Bishop of Dr. Paret’s real position on this Maryland question. The good Bishop was much surprised. “So that’s what they mean in Maryland by being a *Ritualist* ! *Then I am a Ritualist. Dr. Paret could not properly have acted otherwise, and if I had been in Maryland I should have stood side by side with him on that question.*”

drift. And I am sure that clergy and laity will thank me for bringing once more before them, from the files of an old forgotten newspaper, this fine and fearless utterance—so just and so generous—which is, moreover, characteristic of the man who is so soon, as our Bishop and Father in God, to be entrusted with the administration of our tangled ecclesiastical affairs.

6. For, after all this futile contention and disturbance, it is the author of the above forcible letter, it is this sturdy antagonist of the persecuting policy, it is this man who worked for justice and for peace, who has been—all but unanimously—elected BISHOP OF MARYLAND, to occupy the honoured seat of Pinkney and of WHITTINGHAM.

7. And I am happy to be able to add (as indeed it is only just to do) that the conversion of the President of the Standing Committee appears to be absolute and entire; he is now a warm supporter of the Bishop-elect, and was one of the committee of twelve who unanimously proposed his name to the late Convention.

8. What, then, is the net result of all that has been going on since Bishop Whittingham's death, and especially of the line adopted by the Standing Committee on these questions? Either the Standing Committee have changed their opinions (which would be very creditable to them), *or*, they have perceived that the Diocese of Maryland will put up with these doings no longer and have wisely retraced their steps.

9. But (to turn to the question which is at the bottom) has "Ritualism" been put down or swept

away? Not at all. As far as I can see, it is rather spreading, and it is stronger than ever. Why, the Protestant bodies outside of our Church are becoming "ritualistic," in the proper sense of the term, that is, in attending to external ceremonial and æsthetics. Look, for example, at the style of their ecclesiastical architecture. But if you include in the term matters of doctrine, then read the remarkable quotation from Prof. Newman Smyth on page 11 of this pamphlet.

10. Turning to our own churches, I really can see no sign of ritualism diminishing. Take the large and influential congregation whose late rector was so notorious an opponent of Mount Calvary, and whose "zeal, not according to knowledge," aided by the Rev. Dr. Lewin, has turned our Diocese upside down for the past ten years. Take Emmanuel. It has recently, at great cost, been splendidly decorated and embellished. Yes; that very congregation which so seriously objected to the symbolism at Mount Calvary, now conducts its worship surrounded by some one hundred *symbolic dolphins*, elaborately painted on the walls of their church. Nor is this any innovation of the present rector; it was done under Dr. Randolph. The thoughtful visitor to the church, *who may happen to have a memory*, cannot help saying to himself, Is symbolism, then, is Ritualism, after all, so very wrong and dreadful? Surely, after these dolphins, it will be unreasonable to find fault with Mount Calvary for its "two great lights," or even its "seven golden candlesticks." If Emmanuel may

have so many fishes, Mt. Calvary and St. Paul's may have a few little boys in surplices!

"But this is not Ritualism!" Indeed! We were certainly told ten years ago that all this sort of thing was Ritualism; nay, five years ago. And as one who "sat under" the estimable Henry V. D. Johns, I can assure the present generation that that worthy divine would have cut off his two hands before he would have permitted those dolphins in Emmanuel Church. I hope I shall not offend the sensibility of my friends in Emmanuel. I mention this only to show how near we are together after all, and how faint is the line of separation. Not worth fighting about certainly. If High and Broad Churchmen are expected to submit to ecclesiastical trials, and to be tabooed as far as the honors or offices of the Convention are concerned, the Evangelicals, surely, can stand a good-natured laugh at their seeming inconsistency.

Look again at the improved chancel arrangements at St. Peter's. Its altar, which (like that of Emmanuel under Dr. Johns) used to be arranged in regular meeting-house style, is now placed in the eastward position, just like Mount Calvary or Grace. Christ Church, too, is as gorgeous as St. Paul's, and much more handsomely decorated than Mt. Calvary.

It is idle, then, to talk of the Standing Committee having swept Ritualism away, or done anything but "lengthen its cords and strengthen its stakes."

11. I see, looking calmly at the whole history, but one practical result gained by, what I must take leave to call, Dr. Lewin's policy of persecution. Dr.

Paret and Dr. Hodges have been kept out of the Standing Committee and General Convention, and Dr. Leeds was deprived, in 1880 (in a very unkind and unexpected way), of the seat in the latter body he had so long held with honor to the Diocese and with usefulness to the Church. But God forbid! that any churchman in his sober senses, now that the heat has passed away, should calmly think those results *good*, or have any feelings but sorrow and regret when he remembers them.

One other outcome may be hoped for and worked for, viz., that we may all see more clearly than ever the uselessness, the supreme folly, of persecution and oppression. Let us be at peace among ourselves. Let us seek to overcome what we deem error chiefly by argument and discussion; rarely by "going to law"; and never by the least semblance of injustice. Let us do our own work, and in the name of God let our brethren do theirs. Let us hope that the day has at last arrived when Ephraim will not envy Judah, and Emmanuel and St. Barnabas will no longer vex Mount Calvary. (And under a man like Dr. Eccleston, we all know well that Emmanuel will not even wish to do anything of the sort.)

12. I shall conclude with a few passages from the recent admirable and touching *Charge* of the Bishop of London.* His great Diocese, even more than our

* Dr. Jackson. As I write, the mail brings the *New York Churchman* of December 6. I am delighted to observe that the editor was impressed with some of these same passages, and that he has spread them before American churchmen in his widely circulated journal.

own, has been for years and years disturbed by attacks on Ritualism, (carried on, however, legally, in the courts, and not in the Maryland fashion). After this long experience, it is pathetic to read the loving words of the venerable Bishop, entreating his Low Church brethren to stay their hand, to stop going to law, to let him and his Diocese be at peace, and allow the real, beneficent work of the Church to proceed.

Bishop Jackson does not like Ritualism, as is well known, and as the following quotation shows; yet with rare justice he has given Mr. Mackonochie preferment, and he pleads in this earnest strain for a cessation of warfare:

*“I am sure that the multiplication of ceremonies and the sensuous accessories of worship, though attractive to many weak minds, and helpful possibly to a few, have a tendency to distract rather than to concentrate the devotional energies of the mind, to hinder the close contact of the praying soul with God, and at the same time, by the pleasurable excitement of the senses, to impose a fallacy on the worshipper, and to send him away persuaded that he has been devout in prayer and praise, while he has only been enjoying the beauty of the service.**

* I have put this sentence in italics partly to call special attention to it, and also because it exactly expresses my own personal feeling (confirmed by long observation) about the dangers of extravagant ceremonialism; it is a line of thought which I have continuously maintained since 1865 or 1866, which is about the date when the word Ritualism began to be known in this country. But I love to think that decent,

“ But I believe that the remedy for excesses in ritual, as well as for eccentricities of doctrine, is not to be sought in measures of repression, or imposition of penalties. It is the lesson of all history that religious beliefs, be they true or false, and religious observances, whether reasonable or superstitious, are strengthened by opposition, and are clung to only the more fondly if attempted to be repressed by force. The cure is rather to be sought in the supply of defects from which excesses are often the reaction. Cold and dull services, plain rubrics habitually neglected, unfrequent communions [poor sermons, etc.]. . . —these have to bear much of the responsibility of the exaggerations both of ritual worship and of sacramental teaching which for a quarter of a century have disturbed our peace. . . .

“ In face of such a world as this we cannot afford to have dissension among ourselves. We need serried ranks in front of such a foe. *And we may well be content to leave without rebuke ritual we could not use ourselves, and modes of teaching and enforcing God's truth which we do not deem the best,* so long as we see them telling effectually on sin and unbelief and winning souls into the Church's fold. What matters it, if the war is waged successfully,

reverent, orderly, beautiful services like those in St. Paul's, Baltimore, and in many other churches, are more and more appreciated and admired by churchmen, and I welcome every approach to such a standard in Emmanuel or St. Peter's or St. Barnabas's. The old meeting-house style of slovenly *service* will soon be as extinct as the meeting-house itself.

that the weapons are not of exactly the same pattern or temper as our own? If unity is strength, who need it more than the clergy and Church of such a Diocese as ours? . . .

“O brethren, when the shades of closing life are falling, and it is idle to dream of compensating for the faults of the past by resolutions for the future, the mind is forced back on a retrospect where there is mostly a humiliating array of errors and imperfections, opportunities missed, resolves broken, mistakes made, useful plans marred in their execution, and a stewardship which, if not faithless, is yet felt to have greatly failed. In such a retrospect, amidst so much to humble and to grieve, it would be to me a source of unspeakable comfort if, when the burden is to be laid aside and the work is over, I might be permitted to believe that at least I had left my Diocese in unity and peace.”

ACTS I, 24-26.

And they prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two Thou hast chosen, that he may take part of this ministry and apostleship And they gave forth their lots; and the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven Apostles.

The lessons to be learned from the choice of St. Matthias to be an Apostle, which we may call, with sufficient historical accuracy, the first election of a Bishop in the Church of Christ, are neither few nor unimportant; but I shall not now dwell upon them.* I had another purpose in selecting my text, and that was to say a few words upon a kindred topic, in which, as good churchmen, as Christians who love the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, and I will venture to add, even as citizens of our State of Maryland, all to whom I have the privilege of speaking, take a deep and solid interest.

I speak not to gratify mere curiosity; the newspapers and the telegraph have done that. I speak to your *hearts*, because I am sure you have at heart the advancement of God's glory, the good of His

*Some introductory remarks upon the text are here omitted, and a few sentences in the body of the discourse have been slightly enlarged.

Church, the safety, honour and welfare of His people.

For the space of sixteen months, since the lamented death of Bishop Pinkney, our beloved Diocese has been, not absolutely headless indeed, for there is always an ecclesiastical authority over us, but without a Bishop and Chief Pastor. Our Annual Convention was held in May, but eleven months of discussion and thought had failed to indicate the proper man; and though thirteen ballots were taken, still there was no Bishop. Many were in despair, and predictions were freely made that, under the Constitution of this Diocese, which requires a majority of two-thirds of both clergy and laity, no choice would be arrived at for years to come.

Chafing under the disappointment, and weary of waiting any longer, a certain section of churchmen, under the lead of the Rev. Rector of St. Peter's Church, Baltimore (Dr. Grammer), thought it best to endeavour to change the Constitution, and make a bare majority, even of one, sufficient to elect so important an officer as a Bishop, who, when chosen, must, as in the case of husband and wife, remain, for better, for worse, married to his Diocese until death severs the connection. The rest of us, supported by the Rev. Dr. Paret, of Washington,—who delivered a very able argument—strenuously resisted any attempt to alter the fundamental law of the Diocese *pending the election of a Bishop*. And this, because at such a time we were necessarily restless and not able to consider the matter fairly and calmly on its merits.

As the balloting proceeded, a Bishop was chosen, and so the effort to change the Constitution at this last Convention was abandoned. The result—the happy, the excellent result—you all know. After thirty-six tedious ballots a Bishop of Maryland has at length been chosen.

Now whether the mode of election be by an actual lot drawn out of an urn, or by counting our votes after the best use we can make of our human judgment, the result in the end is still overruled by the great Disposer and Governor of all things. “The lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is of the Lord.” He it is that causes one man to be influenced by this argument or motive, and another by that; suggests this thought to one, and that thought to another. “He maketh men to be of one mind in an house.” The whole issue is in His hands, though we, His servants, are still bound to use our minds and form an *honest* judgment.

Let me tell you an incident of this very election. I know a clergyman—not the present speaker, let me add—who felt so doubtful whether the presbyter who at last was actually chosen was the most suitable man for Bishop that he adopted this course: He wrote the name of the Rev. Dr. Paret on one ballot, and the name of another presbyter whom he himself personally preferred on another. He turned these over and mixed them up so that he could not tell which was which. He breathed a short, silent prayer: “Thou Lord, which knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two *Thou* hast chosen.” He then drew by lot one of these names,

and when his turn came to vote, he advanced and dropped the paper in the box without looking to see which it was. Returning to his seat he looked at the other ballot still in his possession and found that he had cast his vote for the Rector of Epiphany, Washington, who is, God willing, so soon to be our Bishop. There were one hundred and twenty-one votes in all; or—may I not say?—"the number of the names together was about one hundred and twenty." "And the lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbered with the eleven Apostles."

And now, my dear brethren, let me speak of the past and present condition of our Diocese, and say a respectful word about our new Bishop. I wish to tell you why I think we ought to be unfeignedly thankful for the result which the Almighty Ruler of the Church has, at least, permitted us to reach, if I may not say, as I believe I might, has directly brought about.

I speak in this strain, not because I have been in general accord in matters of churchmanship with the Bishop-elect, though this *is a fact*; nor yet because I, from the first, personally preferred him to all others, for this is *not* the fact. And yet I do feel most deeply thankful for the result.

I went to the Convention desirous to see chosen as our new Bishop the well-known Rector of Grace Church,* Baltimore (the Rev. Dr. Leeds), whom I,

* The Rev. Dr. Leeds received a *majority* of the votes of the clergy *eight* times; the two-thirds rule of Maryland prevented his election. He obtained 75 votes out of 137, and 65 out of 128. The Rev. Dr. Hodges received from 42 to 52 votes, considerably more than one-third. The Rev. Dr. Coit received 54 votes out of 122, or 13 more than one-third.

like many others, in and out of Maryland, deemed well suited for this critical time, or the equally respected Rector of St. Paul's (the Rev. Dr. Hodges), in the same city, for whom also I cast many votes. When it was thought advisable to go beyond our own borders, I used such little influence as I possessed to make known to my brethren, at their request, the qualifications of an admirable and eminent presbyter of another Diocese, but at one time a resident of Maryland (the Rev. H. A. Coit, D. D., of New Hampshire). But when, on the memorable night of Wednesday, October 29th, after the 28th fruitless ballot, a Committee of Conference, consisting of six clergymen and six laymen (including among the latter two whom I have the pleasure of seeing now before me—one of these the honoured deputy from our own congregation,* and the other † a man of judicial mind, who, though a deputy from another parish, we are happy to claim as belonging also in part to us), when, I say, these twelve gentlemen, who differed so much in opinion among themselves, made a *unanimous* report, and, with one voice, recommended to us the Rev. Wm. Paret, D. D., Rector of Epiphany Parish, Washington, I felt bound to yield my own previous judgment and accept the conclusion at which they, after much consideration, had arrived.

And this I did at once, and after that never cast any ballot except for the presbyter who has now

* Henry R. Hazlehurst, Esq.

† Judge W. A. Stewart, of Baltimore, whose summer country seat is in Howard County.

been elected. I felt, besides, that it was a great concession on the part of the friends of the estimable Rector of Emmanuel Church, Baltimore, who were on that committee; and if the twenty-three clergymen who, even after this report, continued to vote for him, had been able to attain to a spirit of concession equal to that of Dr. Eccleston himself, and of his friends on the Committee of Conference, the contest, which was never anything but good-natured, would have been ended somewhat sooner.

But all is well. The very delay, the gradual steps by which the Bishop-elect rose to his present eminence, make it all the plainer that he is *the man*—the honest choice of the large majority of both orders. He was not chosen by one of those unreasoning impulses which sometimes seize upon a Convention, carrying men off their feet and out of their heads, and making them transfer their votes wildly from one to another without exactly knowing why. It was quiet conviction that did the work, after sleeping on it a whole night. And here, as we Marylanders think, comes out the advantage of the celebrated and much-abused two-thirds rule. At the first ballot on Thursday morning, Dr. Paret's vote rose by a great leap from 57, the night before, to 77. In three ballots more he was elected Bishop by the clergy, and the choice was immediately and gladly confirmed by the laity.

I have not, for years, attended in Maryland so good-tempered a Convention, especially when such burning questions had to be discussed, and so delicate a matter as an Episcopal election was to be accom-

plished. Such a harmonious council could not have been held in this Diocese even three or four years ago. It indicates, therefore, a much happier, more Christian-like state of feeling.

If you are at all acquainted with the current history of the Diocese, you know how sadly it has been disturbed since the memorable Convention held in Washington in 1874, when what is called "*Ritualism*" came up. You know, of course, the contest that has raged ever since about that unfortunate word (for the mention of the *word* seems to excite people more than the thing), and about Mount Calvary Church, for which few dared to say anything kind. You know how the dying embers of strife burst forth into a furious flame in 1879, the moment the aged Whittingham breathed his last; how we have been tossing to and fro since his lifeless hand could no longer guide the rudder of our ecclesiastical ship. Perhaps you are also aware that a goodly number of us—the Bishop-elect was one, your present rector was another—earnestly contended for the rights, under the law, of certain clergymen and candidates for Holy Orders, whose practices we did *not* like, and some of whose peculiar opinions we did *not* approve. But the Prayer Book is broad and comprehensive—comprehensive, mark the word. If you know anything of the history of the book, you know that when it was put into nearly its present shape, some three hundred years ago, it was designed to include two different parties.* I may roughly describe them

* A week after this sermon had been preached, the English mails brought Mr. Gladstone's letter to the Bishop of St. Asaph on the Disestablishment of the Church of England. It is gratifying to

as those who tended towards Puritanism, and those who tended towards Romanism, while Puritans and Romanists, as such, were excluded. Bishop Seabury and Bishop White, two churchmen of different type, also intended to include both these schools, when they drew up, in a spirit of compromise, our present American Prayer Book. At all events, these two schools have both been in our Church since it had

be able to quote so weighty an authority in support of what I have said on the matter of comprehension. The following summary of Mr. Gladstone's remarks are from the *London Spectator* of Oct. 25, 1884 :

"The Prime Minister has written a very interesting and wise letter to the Diocesan Conference at St. Asaph, of which he is a member, on 'The Duty of Churchmen in Regard to Disestablishment,' confining himself to the especial point that their duty is to take care that discussions from within shall not bring the Establishment to an end. Mr. Gladstone remarks that since the Reformation the Anglican Church has been almost the only one which has deliberately set itself to include *both* the parties which struggled together in the Roman Catholic Church before the Reformation. The Anglican Church has deliberately set itself to include both parties just as Parliament includes both political parties ; whereas most other Churches have taken up the position of political clubs, all the members of which profess to be agreed in the same political creed. Of course, the result has been, and must have been, that there has been far more internal strife and discord in the Anglican Church than either in the Church of the Counter-Reformation (the Roman Catholic since the Council of Trent), or in the Puritan Churches which separated themselves from it, just as there is and must be more internal discord in Parliament than there can be in a political club. But, then, the very reason why more discord has been natural and almost necessary is also a reason why it should not be pushed to extremity. *The Anglican Church was meant to include elements of difference, just as other Churches were meant to exclude them ;* and therefore the contending parties in it should jealously respect each other's rights and freedom, and not push their struggles to the internecine point. That was at once Mr. Gladstone's argument for comprehension and excuse for the strenuousness of past and present internal strife. He held that both parties have done great service to the Church, and that neither should try to push the other out."

a beginning. Some extremists on either side seem to wish to exclude all who do not agree with themselves; but I am one of those who not only submit to, but like and admire the broad comprehensiveness of the Prayer Book as it is. For thus maintaining what we believed to be the law of the Church, and doing justice to others, I have been called a "Ritualist," and the Bishop-elect has been complimented with the same epithet. He cared for this, I presume, just as much and just as little as I did and do; for we are all answerable both to God and man for what we *are*, and not for what we may be labeled and nicknamed by prejudiced men. Yet, when one remembers his failings, shortcomings, sins, negligences and ignorances, the most natural thought is, "Enter not into judgment with Thy servant, O Lord, for in Thy sight shall no man living be justified."

But yet it was this—such was the strange and prejudiced state of feeling in this Diocese—that prevented the Rev. Dr. Paret, during all this troubled time, though he is one of our most prudent and wisest presbyters, from serving the Diocese on the Standing Committee; and though he is by far the clearest debater in the House, and one of the best speakers in the whole Church, we were not allowed to send him as a deputy to the General Convention, where he would have been such an honour and ornament to our Diocese, and so useful to the Church at large. I am ashamed to record this, but, alas! it was true.*

* Dr. Paret was a deputy to the General Convention from Central Pennsylvania, and Dr. Hodges from New Jersey. Both of these presbyters lost their seats by accepting rectorships in the Diocese of Maryland.

And now what have we seen? We have seen this very presbyter, who, though not perhaps the leader, was yet the mainstay in this necessary struggle for the rights of the clergy and of the laity, chosen by a large majority to be the Head, the Chief Pastor, the BISHOP of this very Diocese—a majority that must have included many of those who, a few years ago, so completely misunderstood him. The new Bishop can be claimed by no party except the party of *justice*; and, now that the smoke of the battle has begun to clear away, every clergyman and every layman will, it is hoped, claim to belong to that very party!

I spoke just now of the rights of the *laity*, and it is a point I wish to emphasize. *Your rights*, my brethren, as churchmen were imperilled by the novel view of the law (now, thank God! abandoned) that was taken by a majority of our Standing Committee some four or five years ago. When this controversy first began, I remember that one of our very best laymen,* an old man, now gone to his rest, and one who hated strife, said, gently but firmly: "Every father of a family who has a son that may be destined for the Holy Ministry ought to resist this unaccountable tyranny of the Standing Committee." For, my friends and brethren, just think what it meant. Not one of you could, with any confidence, have sent a son, however able and fit, into the ministry of our Church in this Diocese during that unhappy period. The hundreds of dollars spent on his education even at the author-

* Mr. W. G. Harrison, of Baltimore.

ized theological seminaries of the Church would have been wasted. Your son would have been obliged, by law, to present testimonials as to his character signed by me, the rector, and by our vestry; and, on the new principles acted upon by our Standing Committee in 1879, 1881 and 1882, the testimonial might have been set aside, and your son left out in the cold (as the Rev. Mr. Martin was), because I, your rector, one of the signers, might possibly not have pronounced "SATISFACTORILY" the Committee's shibboleth of churchmanship. Or they might have refused the testimonial of both rector and vestry on the ground that we have long had in this church, with the acquiescence of the rector, vestry and congregation, a beautiful memorial window with a prayer for the peace of the departed inscribed upon it; and this pious usage of the Church Catholic,* and irrepressible instinct of hu-

*I add the following quotation from the now famous Prof. Newman Smyth, of Andover, to indicate more clearly what I mean on a subject upon which no one should speak or write lightly. It is remarkable to meet, in this Protestant professor, a wider catholicity than we find in some of our own Churchmen. Professor Smyth says:

"The belief of the primitive Church respecting prayers for the dead has recently been collated and carefully examined by Canon Luckock in his book, *After Death*. 'The conclusion,' he writes, 'from a full consideration of the foregoing argument is that the practice of praying for the faithful dead was universally adopted in primitive times; and though, as we have seen, for wise reasons it was allowed to drop entirely out of our public worship, yet such a state of things cannot possibly be regarded as permanent' (p. 252). Referring to the mediæval abuse of this primitive custom, which led to its abandonment in the Reformation, Canon Luckock says: 'We may well believe that in the temporary obscuration of the primitive practice and the almost complete withdrawal of what is confessedly a most consolatory doctrine, we can see a distinct sign

manity, is the very point of churchmanship with regard to which the Standing Committee stirred up such an unreasoning outcry a few years ago.* They might have refused, without giving any reasons at all, or without having any reasons to give. Therefore, I repeat, it was a struggle for the rights of the *laity*, no less than for those of the clergy; but it must be remembered that it was, on one side, an unavoidable contest for defence; the attack came from others. "We laboured for *peace*, but when we spake unto them thereof, they made them ready to battle."

This last Convention and this remarkable Episcopal election imply a *new era*. It means that with our new Bishop we shall begin a renewed life, that Maryland will become her old self again, that we shall wipe out our past follies and contentions over trifles, or at least not repeat them in the future. We shall not, we may hope, get into an excitement because one clergyman wears a chasuble and another refuses to lay aside his black gown. We shall not be afraid that priest-craft and the confessional are

of a primitive purpose and a visitation upon this and preceding generations for other men's sins' (p. 245). It is certainly a fair question whether in a deep consciousness of the oneness of Christ's kingdom in this world and the world to come we might not now safely avail ourselves in public worship, as well as in private devotion, of such expressions in regard to the dead as are to be found in the epitaphs in the Catacombs and in the ancient liturgies of the Church. So St. Paul expressed out of a full heart his wish that the Lord might grant to Onesiphorus *to find mercy in that day.*"—2d Tim. i. 18. *The Orthodox Theology of To-Day*, p. 188.

*The allusion is, of course, to the unsuccessful attempt of a majority of the Standing Committee of that date to prosecute the Rev. Messrs. Richey and Perry, which led to the painful and much to be regretted attack upon our good Bishop Whittingham.

going to be imposed upon us against our wills, because, here and there, a few weak-minded persons delight to call opening their grief to their pastor by the name of "making their confession." And if this well-known permission and advice of the Prayer Book be abused (as no doubt it has been both in England and America), we shall leave such errors to be corrected by the proper authorities, by common sense, and above all, by time; we shall not attempt to reform them by panic and *misapplication* of the law.

I have hailed with joy the indications of toleration and of peace. Our Standing Committee, in 1883, quietly received, as all other Dioceses would do,* testimonials of candidates signed by the very men whose papers they formerly rejected (without giving reasons) as "unsatisfactory." Every one of the candidates they rejected is now a faithful and accepted minister of the Church. The zeal, earnestness and self-sacrifice of the Mt. Calvary clergy, their faithful work among the poor, and among the neglected coloured people, and their patience under persecution, have won the day, as such qualities always will. They are generally respected and esteemed throughout the Diocese. So great, indeed, is the change of sentiment, that if there were any danger of these clergy leaving the Diocese, I should not be surprised to see a petition signed by the Standing Committee itself—President and all—begging them to continue their labours among us! Churchmen in Maryland are at last beginning to realize the

* With the possible, but not probable, exceptions of Virginia and West Virginia.

truth (to use the words of Bishop Walsham How) that "you cannot have one type of service and worship that will please and satisfy everybody."

Your hopes for the new era of which I speak would, I am sure, have been raised had you been present when, upon the announcement of the approval by the laity of the choice of the clergy, the whole House burst out with one accord into thanksgiving, singing:

"Praise God from whom all blessings flow!"

And even more touching was the scene when the Bishop-elect was presented in person to the Convention by the two presbyters, Rev. Dr. Eccleston and Rev. Dr. Hodges, who, along with him, had obtained so many suffrages for the sacred office. Received in dignified, graceful and generous terms by the Reverend President, the Rev. Dr. Leeds, who himself had so nearly been chosen, the Bishop-elect responded in words and tones and manner of lowly and most sincere self-abasement. That clear, ringing voice whose every accent usually penetrates to the remotest corners of our largest buildings could, for once, scarce be heard even in the hushed and almost awful stillness, while, under deep emotion, which told the warm heart hidden beneath his honest, downright manner, he signified his acceptance of an office whose dignity and responsibility, as well as the circumstances of his election to it, evidently almost overwhelmed him. The few manly words that he could command himself to say were full of feeling and humility, and gave the happiest earnest for the success of the Episcopate that is to come.

“ Strong in the Lord of Hosts,
 And in His mighty power ;
 Who in the strength of Jesus trusts
 Is more than conqueror.”

And now a last word of cordial welcome, dear brethren, for the Bishop whom God has given us, not because there is need for me so to speak to your already loyal hearts, but because the word is pleasant to me to say, and agreeable, I trust, for you to hear.

I do not know how many of you are already personally acquainted with the distinguished Rector of Epiphany Parish, Washington. If you do know him, you are aware how fully he deserves the high encomium, the warm welcome—rapidly growing into enthusiasm—with which his name has been received. Under God’s good Providence, the lot has fallen this time upon a *strong man*, a man of parts and power, a man who has shown himself to possess that rare quality of *righteousness* (which primarily means justice)—the ability to be *just* even to those with whom one may not agree. It is one of the rarest gifts.

He is a man of ripe learning, of remarkable administrative ability in his great and growing parish, of cautious judgment, not too quick to take a stand, but when he has taken it, and knows himself right, and feels that he has put on the armour of God, he stands immovable as a rock. I have seen him under ungenerous provocation ; I have known him grossly misrepresented, both in and out of the Convention ; and I am sure that he tries to follow the apostolic maxim : “ Swift to hear, slow

to speak, slow to wrath"; for he knows that the "wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God."

One of the secular papers of Baltimore has said that Maryland's new Bishop will be second to few of his brethren in zeal, learning and activity. I believe this to be perfectly true, and it might have been added with equal truth, second to none in religious earnestness and conscientious devotion to the duties of the high and weighty office to which he has been called, under circumstances which seem clearly to indicate the Finger and Voice of the Master, saying, "Friend, go up higher."

"We are sure that when he comes to us he will come in the fullness of the blessing of the Gospel of Christ." And we shall receive him as our Bishop, not only with loyal obedience, but with a joyful welcome. We shall listen to his lucid instruction from pulpit and chancel and Episcopal throne, by voice and by pen, with attentive respect, and with a sense of intellectual enjoyment as well as of spiritual profit.

Let us, then, not fail to add our supplications, both in public and private, that the new Bishop for whom this widowed Diocese gives thanks to-day, may, in the magnificent and stirring language of this Sunday's Epistle,* *be strong in the Lord and in the power of His might; that he may put on the whole armour of God; that, having done all, he may stand, in the future as in the past, girt about with truth, having on the breastplate of righteousness (or*

* The Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity.

justice), and his feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace ; that the only sword he wields may be the sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God ; that he may never lay aside the shield of faith where-with he may be able to quench those fiery darts from which even bishops are not exempt. Let us ask that utterance may be given him that he may open his mouth boldly to make known the mystery of the Gospel, for which he is an ambassador, that therein he may speak boldly, as he ought to speak.

And all this he will do, the Lord being his helper, to the utmost of his ability.

It remains for us and all true churchmen of Maryland to support him earnestly and faithfully by will, by word and by deed. Amen!

END.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 566 671 4

BK

5995

P3 H3



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 566 671 4 