


UC-NRLF



\$B 297 526



EX LIBRIS



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

934 PERCEVAL (Hon. and Rev. A. P.) Vind.
of the Principles of the Authors of the
" *Tracts* "—HUSSEY, " Reasons for Vot-
ing "—MACMULLEN, " Two Exercises
for the Degree of B.D."—BENNETT
(W. J. E.) " 1st Letter to Lord John
Russell," and another, in 1 vol, 8vo,
boards, 3s 1841-50

Mayors Salway
Rowmbe

A

FIRST LETTER

TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

LORD JOHN RUSSELL, M.P.

ON

THE PRESENT PERSECUTION

OF

A certain Portion of the English Church.

WITH

A SERMON,

PREACHED AT S. PAUL'S, KNIGHTSBRIDGE,

ON SUNDAY MORNING AND EVENING, NOVEMBER 17, 1850.

BY

THE REV. WILLIAM J. E. BENNETT, M.A.

PERPETUAL CURATE OF S. PAUL'S, KNIGHTSBRIDGE.

Third Edition.

LONDON :

W. J. CLEAVER, 46, PICCADILLY.

MDCCCL.

Price 1s. 6d. ; by post, 2s.

"The name of Popery is more odious than paganism among divers of the more simple sort, so as whatsoever they hear named popish, they presently conceive deep hatred against it, imagining there can be nothing contained in that name but needs it must be exceeding detestable."—HOOKER'S *ECCL. POLITY*, Book iv. 4.

L E T T E R,

ETC.

MY LORD,—

I AM desirous of informing your Lordship, as one of my chief parishioners, and as one also charged by our Sovereign Lady the Queen to administer the government of this kingdom, and therein to keep order, peace, and harmony among her subjects—I am desirous of informing you, in both these capacities, that I am in great trouble and distress of mind at the present moment in regulating the affairs of my parish. I am also desirous of forwarding you a copy of my sermon preached at S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, your parish church, on Sunday the 17th November. The sermon, should you possibly spare time to read it, refers to the difficulties and embarrassments under which we all are labouring as to the good order and decency of Divine service; as to freedom of conscience in worshipping our God without bodily fear; as to a great alarm under which we daily live, lest some sin of sacrilege should be committed by a tumultuous and disorderly mob which is continually molesting us in our holy offices, and threatening violence to our church and to our persons.

I wish to inform you, my Lord, that on Sunday the 10th of November, while I was performing the duties of Divine service in the church of S. Barnabas, a tumultuous crowd assembled in the streets round about the church, and that a band of persons who had congregated together no doubt for this purpose within the very church walls, was guilty of a violent outrage against all decency, in uttering hisses, and exclaiming “No

mummery!" "No popery!" and other similar cries, alarming the decent worshippers who are in the habit of frequenting our church. I wish to inform you that in consequence of this outrage, being literally in fear lest some very grievous act of desecration might be committed, the churchwardens and myself thought it advisable to close the church for the evening service, and so it must continue to be closed, until these tumultuous assemblages are stopped, and that consequently our poor parishioners, and other respectable persons who are in the habit of attending Divine service at S. Barnabas, are now hindered from so doing, and are in a great degree deprived of their spiritual privileges.

I wish to inform you that since that time it has been thought necessary by the Police Commissioners that our church and residence should be guarded night and day; and that we are at present under the vigilant inspection of police constables, who are watching the streets without cessation lest mischief should arise. I wish to inform you, that on Sunday Nov. 17, a very large mob of most tumultuous and disorderly persons collected together a second time all round the church, and this with a much greater demonstration of violence than on the preceding Sunday—that a force of one hundred constables was required to keep the mob from overt acts of violence; that notwithstanding the exertions of the police, much violence *was* committed, and a leader of the rioters taken into custody; that the mob again assembled at the evening service at three o'clock, and were guilty again of violent cries, yells, and other noises, battering at the doors of the church, and disturbing the whole congregation—that similar scenes occurred again on Sunday the 24th of November, when I was interrupted in my sermon by outcries and other signs of disaffection as before; all this tumult, your Lordship will please to remember, arising from persons collected from all parts of London—non-parishioners. I wish to inform you that the effect of this has been, that the poor, the timid, and particularly women and children, have assured me that they *dare not* any longer

attend Divine service; that they are so intimidated, as well in bodily fear, as also shocked by the blasphemous expressions of the multitude, to which they are compelled to listen, that they think it advisable to remain at home until these disturbances are put down.

I wish to inform you, that, in consequence of this, we on our part, I mean the clergy, are very seriously crippled and hindered in the various pastoral works of our calling; that the minds of our parishioners are disturbed, and kept in an unhealthy stretch of excitement; that the peace and love with which it is our duty to look upon each other, however great our differences of opinion, are gone; that hatred, animosity, and bitterness of spirit, are engendered among us all; and that we are, in short, both clergy and people, in a very great state of trouble and distress; that we look forward to the next Sunday, when the greater services of the Church will again be performed, under considerable fear that some violent outbreak may take place. In short, the whole idea of worshipping our GOD, in the peace and love of Christians, is almost destroyed. It is time indeed, my Lord, when a congregation of Christian worshippers is obliged to have detective police within the walls of their church to keep order, and a body of one hundred constables without, to keep off an unruly mob from bursting in and violating the Lord's sanctuary; when, in their attendance at divine service, the parishioners come in and go out in actual bodily fear; when the residence of a simple inoffensive clergyman is obliged to be guarded, all day and night, by special police constables, as though he were in a state of siege, defending himself against an enemy;—it is time, my Lord, then, that we ask ourselves the question—What is the meaning of all this? How has it come to pass? Where is the cause of it? *Who has done it?*

I am about to tell you, my Lord, who has done it. I am about, if you will have the patience to listen, to tell you where lies the moving cause of all this outrage and blasphemy. To those who have eyes to see, alas, it is too plain!

In walking through my parish but a few days since, I was met by a man offering to me for sale a slip of paper, purporting to be a letter from your Lordship to the Bishop of Durham. And, shortly afterwards, I saw in a shop window the same letter advertised, with a great shew of attraction, at price two shillings and sixpence per hundred. Of course I could not but be attracted by seeing your Lordship's name appended to a letter to the Bishop of Durham. Knowing the troubles which now beset our unhappy Church,—its many schisms, wants, and infirmities,—I might have been pardoned if I had imagined a letter to the Bishop of Durham suggesting some healing medicine for our wounds; pointing out some stay and comfort in our troubles; promising some synod, or convocation for deliberation on our distracted state; I might have imagined a scheme for additional bishops; some enlargement of the national education of the poor; something, in fact, to help us on and guide us to deeper unity and more fervent love among ourselves.

But, my Lord, what was my surprise when I found that your letter was no more or less than an attack upon the Bishop of Rome; that it was a manifesto full of anger and indignation against a power said to be feared *now*, though it had been for twenty-five years, or thereabouts, sedulously courted, cultivated, and nursed up into its present condition, by no other than yourself. And, what was my surprise, not unmixed with something deeper, to find that, although the Bishop of Rome was held up as a great source of danger to the mighty empire of Great Britain, at which I wondered; there was still a greater danger behind, at which I wondered more. It is said in that letter—

“There is a danger, however, which alarms me much more than any aggression of a foreign sovereign.

“Clergymen of our own Church, who have subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles, and acknowledged in explicit terms the Queen's supremacy, have been the most forward in leading their flocks, ‘step by step, to the very verge of the precipice.’ The honour paid to saints, the claim of infallibility for the Church, the superstitious use of the sign of the Cross, the muttering of the Liturgy so as to disguise the language in which it is written, the recommendation of auricular con-

fession, and the admission of penance and absolution,—all these are things pointed out by clergymen of the Church of England as worthy of adoption, and are now openly reprehended by the Bishop of London in his charge to the clergy of his diocese.

“What then, is the danger to be apprehended from a foreign prince of no great power, compared to the danger within the gates from the unworthy sons of the Church of England herself?”

“I have little hope that the propounders and framers of these innovations will desist from their insidious course. But I rely with confidence on the people of England; and I will not bate a jot of heart or hope so long as the glorious principles and the immortal martyrs of the Reformation shall be held in reverence by the great mass of a nation which looks with contempt on the mummeries of superstition, and with scorn at the laborious endeavours which are now making to confine the intellect and enslave the soul.”

Having read this letter, which I did very carefully, my attention was fixed to the peculiar day of its date, November 4th, and I could not help remarking that it was a curious coincidence that this condemnation of the Bishop of Rome should tally so closely with the popular delights concerning Guy Fawkes. Then I looked on from November the 5th to November 9th, the one almost as great a day as the other in the annals of the city of London; and when the day came, I anxiously read the speeches of the Lord Chancellor, and Chief Justice, and of yourself; and it was curious to remark how only one topic seemed to engross all parties. It is reported that the Lord Chancellor said—

“There are some who have thought it right to depart from that simplicity of Christian worship which our Divine Saviour adopted and left us an example of, and who have sought to approximate as near as possible to Romish forms, one would almost think, to invite that very invasion with which we have been recently visited.”

I was somewhat struck by this novel remark of the Lord Chancellor as to the “*simplicity of Christian worship which our Lord adopted*”. I had always thought that our Blessed Saviour worshipped in the *Synagogue* which was of the Jews—and in the *Temple*, under a most gorgeous, minute, and ceremonial ritual, concerning which, his Lordship might learn, if he had time to study in the Books of the Law of God; and I also thought that the disciples of our Lord were called “Christians first at Antioch”, long after.

Then followed your Lordship's speech, which is reported in the following words—

“ I can only say, gentlemen, that that attachment to the religious freedom of this country which I have hitherto felt, will always continue to animate my breast, and that it will be my duty to maintain to the utmost of my power the supremacy of our sovereign, and the religious liberties of the people, from whatever quarter they may be assailed. Let me add, however, one thing further. When perils much more grave, much more imminent, impended over this country, a wise princess who at that time ruled our destinies, thought fit to call to her aid all those, whatever might be their religious persuasion, who were faithful to the throne, and true to the interests of their country. Such was the conduct of Elizabeth in times of as great danger as ever occurred in the country. Such conduct, I will venture to say, is worthy of imitation; and I believe that with religious liberty established in this country, persons of all religious persuasions, while obeying the dictates of their consciences as to the mode of worship they think it right to adopt, may rally round the institutions of the country, pay a grateful homage to the Crown for the protection they enjoy, and rejoice that they live in a land where freedom is generally, and I trust I may say permanently, established.”

Now all this, I confess, did somewhat startle me. I could not conceive how it was that the members of Her Majesty's Government could find themselves of a sudden such deep masters of Divinity as thus to pronounce *ex cathedrâ* upon the deep mysteries of our most holy faith. It was a wonder to me how your Lordship should have found time to add to the incessant toils of your political office the study of theology to such an extent, as to pronounce on some of the most difficult dogmas of the Church. But, nevertheless, I said to myself—this letter is a very important thing, be it as it may: I compared the unhappy disturbances at our church of S. Barnabas with those speeches at Guildhall—I compared the mob, with its outcries of “*No Popery*”, “*No Mummeries*”, and the like, with your Lordship's letter, which breathes the same spirit, of “no mummeries of superstition”—“no superstitious ceremonies”—and the like. I said to myself—It cannot be very much a wonder that ignorant persons, consisting mostly of the lowest orders of society, should be so stirred up to molest us poor people of S. Barnabas, when the

Prime Minister himself writes them a letter and tells them that we are more dangerous than even the Pope of Rome.

But your Lordship will perhaps say, "I never mentioned *S. Barnabas*. I only spoke *generally* of a certain party in the Church." No, my Lord, you did *not* mention *S. Barnabas*,—but your residence is known to be in Chesham Place,—you are known to have been a worshipper in *S. Paul's Church*, from which *S. Barnabas* is an off-shoot. You are known to be intimately acquainted, from your parochial connexion, with all that is done there—and the inference is so plain that any child could have made it—namely, that *S. Paul's* and *S. Barnabas* were the places which you really had in your mind, and the clergy of whom you spoke, among others—the clergy of those churches.

Your letter to the people, coupled with the speeches at the Guildhall, speaks just to this effect—"Listen to me, people of England, and specially inhabitants of London. There is a great danger, as you all know, from the Bishop of Rome, who has just issued a bull, making a Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and other bishops, of his own communion. This is a great act of power and aggression against the Queen's supremacy; and it is my opinion that no one has a right to say anything concerning bishops and the episcopal superintendance of any of the people of this country, save only the Queen. It is plain that if you do not look to it, you will have all the people converted to the Roman faith,—you will have the Queen's crown in danger. Take care of your liberties. But, my good friends, I should like to tell you something further, and I beg you to listen to this most attentively:—however great a danger there is arising from the Pope, I will tell you of another which is even greater. There are a set of clergymen in the Church of England, who are peculiar in their method of performing divine service. They do and say such and such things (then you mention them); they teach this, and they teach that; they do this, and they do that;—and let me tell you that it is from these men that the dan-

ger of Popery comes. If it had not been for these clergy of the Church of England, you would never have had anything to trouble you in regard of the Church of Rome. Now take care of your Protestant liberties,—raise a ‘*no Popery*’ cry, and protect the Royal Supremacy.”

What followed? Why of course the newspapers echoed your cry. Your Lordship had given the major premiss,—the Newspapers supplied the minor,—the Mob drew the conclusion.

Did you want them to draw the conclusion? However, so it was. A conclusion inevitable. Though I had been sorely puzzled to know why we were so attacked at S. Barnabas’; now it was plain enough. For days and days, not a single newspaper but teemed with letters and articles about our poor inoffensive church; though I had been before sorely puzzled about it in my simplicity, now it all came upon me in a moment of enlightenment. *How was it possible they should avoid it?* How was it possible, when the uncultivated, ignorant minds of the common people were so skilfully plied with incendiary matter by the Prime Minister of England, backed by the Lord Chancellor and an unscrupulous public Press, that they should not take fire? When the law in Court of Chancery, and the law in Court of Queen’s Bench, represented by grave and solemn men, spoke out from a Guildhall dinner, and egged on the multitude with speeches about “Civil and religious Liberty”; and with many jestings about the Pope, and when Sir Peter Laurie wound up the story by saying: “Whether ministers led or followed, one thing was certain—BRITONS never would be slaves”; to what? “either to Puseyism or to Popery”! How, my Lord, could we wonder any longer at what had taken place? Why, it would have been a perfect miracle had we escaped. You might as well have laid a train of gunpowder from Chesham Place, stretching along the streets to poor S. Barnabas’ church, and then put into the hands of your friends, “the people”, a torch, and

have said : “ Now you know where the mischief is ” ; and then have expected that the torch would not have been applied to the train.

Will your Lordship allow me to say a few words, first on the subject of your consistency in regard of this matter, and then in regard of your theological opinions.

I remember a certain period in your Lordship’s political life—it was the year 1835 ; when, being appointed Minister of State for the Home Department, you became a candidate for the representation of South Devon ; and notwithstanding your popularity as a minister just accepting place, and other advantageous circumstances in that county, you were defeated by a majority of upwards of six hundred. You then addressed the electors in these words : “ To the effects of intimidation and undue influence ; *on the temporary alarm, on weak minds, caused by the revival of the cry of ‘ No POPERY ’ my defeat is to be attributed.* ” So that Popery and your Lordship were once identified. I remember well, even earlier than that, the many contests which used to take place in the House of Commons on the great subject of “ the Catholic claims ”, and how you used to be an invariable champion on their behalf. So that “ Popery ” has not *always* been a bane to you. I call to mind also the fact of your advocating, for many years, grants of the national money for the education of the Roman Catholic Clergy at Maynooth ; so that neither the propagation of the faith of the Church of Rome could possibly *then* have been sinful in your eyes, nor, of course, could its existence in this country, at that time, have been thought by you dangerous to the Queen’s supremacy.

I have always considered that you have hitherto been a staunch, firm, and faithful advocate, and, in my opinion, a just advocate, of the rights of conscience. Both towards Dissenters, as well as Roman Catholics, you have invariably manifested a tolerant disposition ; not considering that religion, or religious forms of belief, should be any

cause of the loss of the rights of citizenship. I bear in mind also the fact, that you advocate the rights of conscience to such an extent, that you have brought a Bill into the House of Commons for the purpose of allowing Jews to take part in the legislation of our country; and that you are notoriously of opinion, that not even the denial of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ ought to form any bar to the free use of all the privileges and honors of our country. I call to mind also the fact, that you esteem the education of the poor of such great importance, that even creeds and dogmas of faith should be given up in order to combine every form of religious profession in a grand scheme of universal knowledge. Thus, in all points, I find you so far from being narrow-minded or bigoted to any one set of opinions, that you gladly ignore all the laws and obligations of every Church whatsoever. I find that you fly, whensoever it may suit you, to the teaching of those who are entirely opposed to the English Church, such as the Presbyterians, while nominally you remain within her pale; that you uphold the educational system of Dissenters who adopt no creed whatever, while you simultaneously worship in a Church which anathematizes heresy, and insists upon creeds as embodying truths vital to salvation. I find that your idea of the faith of the Gospel is large, broad, liberal, free; that you would not have yourself crippled or confined by any narrow circle of man's (as you call them) decrees or opinions; that you make an eclectic system of your own, and claim the right of worshipping in the morning in a communion which says, that without Bishops there is no Church, while you worship in the evening in a communion which denies the episcopal grace altogether: in short, I find by the whole course of your political life, that you are most liberal, generous, and unfettered by any bonds of prejudice, to either creed, party, or Church. And finding this to be the case, I understand then very clearly what you mean by the clergy "enslaving the soul", and "confining the intellect", which otherwise I could not have

understood. "Enslaving the soul", points to the dogmatic teaching of any Church whatsoever. "Confining the intellect", advocates the free and rationalistic use of GOD's great gift to men—the *mind*. "Enslaving the soul", would be tantamount to believing creeds such as the Athanasian. "Confining the intellect", would be the necessity of belief in the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, or in the real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament. In fact, my Lord, it is clear, in regard to your faith, judging it by your conduct, that you are in religion as in politics, a LIBERAL. You are not a prejudiced man. You are not a bigot. You are not narrow-minded. Consequently I should suppose, *a priori*, that in regard to the *State*, or the *Crown*, or the *Government* administering the Crown, you would be of opinion, that the imposition of any doctrine by such an evidently human institution as *that*, would be the very severest of tyranny; that the idea of a man's faith being bound down by a mere earthly king,—the idea of a *number* of men's faith, that is, a *Church*, the idea of a great community of Christians being bound in things spiritual to obey the supremacy, or final adjudication, or decision of a Royal Court of *mere men*, that this idea would be dreadfully abhorrent to your feelings. A Royal Supremacy Church one would think the very last which a man of your liberal sentiments would tolerate,—one which your faith would reject as impossible to be founded on GOD's Word, and your principles deny as being unworthy the freedom of the human intellect. In short, I should say, *a priori*, that a State Church, State creeds, State Courts, State cathedrals, State deans and canons, and, above all, State Bishops, would be a piece of king's craft odious in your eyes, as "confining the intellect and enslaving the soul" most foully, most fatally.

My Lord—I agree with you entirely in the latter portion of what might have been expected of you *a priori*—I disagree with you in what I find existing in you as a fact—but again I agree with you in the moving principle by which you are guided and directed in your course. The moving principle is love of free-

dom, toleration, liberty; in that I agree. Your actions flowing out of that principle, namely, your letter to the Bishop of Durham and speech at Guildhall—in these I disagree, because they are inconsistent; and therefore, that which I might have expected *a priori*, does not exist. For while you cry out most heartily, “Liberty of Conscience”, you stop the mouths of men, confine the intellects of men, and enslave the souls of men, by a great, cumbrous, unwieldy, tyrannical machine called a State Church, which you enforce against us without mercy, and while you find fault with Christ’s Holy Catholic Church for dogmatizing in creeds, you nevertheless rule them with a rod of iron in the dogmas of an Act of Parliament. While you yourself get free of Articles and Queen’s Supremacy in the liberty of a Presbyterian, you charge the unfortunate clergy of the English Church with their bounden duty of submission to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Queen’s supreme headship and government over them in things spiritual. My Lord, you are like a jailor who has manacled and fettered his prisoner, and being free himself, stands off and laughs at him.

I heartily agree with the American Minister at the Guildhall Dinner, who said—

“Where was it that the first stand was made against the royal prerogative of collecting Ship-money? Here, in the city of London, by that immortal man, John Hampden.”

Well then, citizens of London, and you my Lord—to contend against a royal prerogative, if it be an unjust one, is not in itself abstractedly wrong. If John Hampden is esteemed by you a patriot because he contended against the royal prerogative of Ship-money, why should you mark us out as being criminally wrong, and call us “insidious” because we question the Royal Supremacy in that portion of it which bears upon our religious liberties. You will understand carefully that there is a great distinction between the question of loyal and dutiful obedience to our Queen, and the question of the Prime Minister ruling the Church against her own doctrines and against her own courts. We are of opinion, that

the Royal Supremacy has been unjustly strained and distorted, pushed in many cases of late into unjustifiable acts of tyranny, and therefore we claim the same right that John Hampden claimed, of doing our best conscientiously to protest against it, and, constitutionally to abrogate that portion of it wherein the injustice lies. You will remember that John Hampden, whom you revere as a patriot, did something more than this. You were very anxious once, my Lord, when you saw rottenness and corruption in the representative system of the House of Commons, to reform it, and you endured much labour and difficulty in attaining your object. If you had been accused of being "insidious" when you did so, or of being an enemy to your country, when you only meant to benefit her, you would have been very indignant, and would have said that persons were unjust in so calumniating you. I only claim the same justice at your Lordship's hands, in reference to the constitution of the Church, as your Lordship used to claim, in reference to the constitution of our country. I am of opinion, with many others, that there is much rottenness and corruption in the English Church. I mean in the election of her chief pastors, and in undue interference with doctrine, and I am of opinion that the source of the corruption is the Royal Supremacy as now administered. I exercise an Englishman's right to say this. I exercise an Englishman's right to combine with others, in measures for its reform. Because we do this on the principle of John Hampden in the Ship-money, and your own principle on the Reform Bill, and still more strongly on the Catholic Emancipation Bill, I claim of you in consistency to acknowledge, that it is very possible that we may be doing it neither as "insidious" in regard of our faith, nor as enemies in regard of our Church.

But, my Lord, either not understanding this, or else wilfully passing it by—I hope the former—you throw dust into people's eyes, and say that we, a certain portion of the English clergy, are bringing in the Pope, because we speak against the Queen's supremacy.

It is not the Queen's supremacy that we complain of—it is the prime-minister's supremacy that we complain of,—not the thing, but the abuse. Your Lordship is very earnest in your cry for “liberty of conscience.” Why will you not concede it to us the clergy, as well as all other of her Majesty's subjects? You cry out against us, that we are enslaving the souls of the people, we cry out against you, that you are enslaving the souls of the clergy; that you are crippling, deforming, poisoning the fountains of jurisdiction and the springs of the pure doctrines of the Catholic faith. If “civil and religious liberty” means anything, we have a right to say this, and to act upon it, and that right we claim. It is your *inconsistency* that we would point out to the world, in fighting so bravely and enduring so much for a principle in yourself, and for yourself, which you will not concede to another.

My Lord, I quite agree with you that no man has a power to enslave the soul of another, that a man's conscience is free. But I charge you with inconsistency in not following this up, and allowing *a fortiori* that neither has a State such power.

If one man has not the power, neither have many men. If I have no power to enslave *your* soul, neither have you to enslave *mine*; and I claim the liberty you enjoy for yourself. What the Dissenters have, the Presbyterians, the Quakers, the Roman Catholics, and I think justly, have, I claim for the English Church, and for myself. A man's conscience is a man's life; a man's soul is himself. We are under shackles; we have a right to get free if we can, as John Hampden did, whom you revere.

I agree with your cry of civil and religious liberty. I believe that penal laws against religion are the greatest acts of tyranny of which a country can be guilty. I have read many of your Lordship's speeches with the highest delight in the enthusiasm of my youth, when you fought hard and desperately against the (as I thought) bigoted and narrow-minded cries about Church and State, and about the danger of the Pope and his

bulls. I have rejoiced exceedingly, as session after session went on, and Roman Catholics were at length admitted to their undoubted right to sit in parliament as Christian men serving loyally a Christian sovereign. I rejoiced to see penal statutes after penal statutes abrogated, as marks of antiquated prejudice, and a relic of a mere cowardly fear unworthy of a mind that believed *truth* greater than *falsehood*. For I said, if the truth is with us, what matters the Pope? If the truth is with the Pope, what matter our acts of parliament?

And I agree with your Lordship even more lately still, even up to last November 9th, when you said:—

“Persons of *all* religious persuasions, while obeying the dictates of their consciences, as to the mode of worship they think it right to adopt, may rally round the institutions of the country, pay a graceful homage to the Crown for the protection they receive, and rejoice that they live in a land where freedom is generally, and I trust I may say permanently, established.”

But then I ask, how is it, my Lord, that the poor “clergy of the English Church may not be permitted, in the dictates of *their* conscience, to use the mode of worship which they think it right to adopt?” Where is the religious freedom of sending down upon S. Barnabas a violent mob, to teach us how to worship our God, and not permit us to do as we like ourselves, in a land where “freedom is established”? Are the clergy of the Church of England the only persons who have no *consciences*? Your Lordship says: “Yes, but you are guilty of error: your practices are not in accordance with the Church of which you are members.” I reply: “Who made your Lordship judge of that?” You say: “Why, I see the Bishop has judged it so”—then you quote the Bishop, and shelter yourself under him. But, my Lord, the Bishop is not *infallible*. You object to the infallibility even of the *Church*. (See your own letter.) Much more you must object to the infallibility of a single bishop. How you would throw the bishop aside, with perfect contempt, if he were to say something in an episcopal charge about the schism of members of the Church of England taking their children to be baptized by a dis-

senting minister, or about Church of England members frequenting conventicles, which, according to the Canons, is a censurable, if not a punishable act: how you would rise up in indignation against such an infringement of the rights of conscience then. But where is your consistency? You quote the Bishop and the Church on your side, when you want to make use of an argument against an adversary; you throw them altogether out, when they make against yourself. Is that fair, my Lord? No; you know it is not. But it suits your purpose just now to crush a certain party in the Church, and to ward off the indignation of the people, which is burning against Popery, by appearing to take their side just for the moment. You are not on their side *really*. You do not *really* mean that you think the Pope dangerous. You do not *really* think that the Queen's supremacy in temporal things—otherwise her crown—is in danger in consequence of a papal bull. You do not *really* mean that a number of Roman bishops, exercising spiritual jurisdiction over their people, is an aggression against the Queen's right to her throne; for if you did, you would not surely act as you have done all your life, in endeavouring to promote this very point. You would not have repealed statute after statute to prepare the way for it. You would not have given large grants of money to the College of Maynooth. You would not have acknowledged Roman archbishops and bishops in the colonies, and have paid them salaries, and have given them precedence over English bishops, and have recognized their titles. You would not have counselled and aided in various Acts of Parliament in which these titles and salaries are made the law of the land. You would not have conceded in the court of Dublin a priority of rank, or, at least, a recognition of rank in the Irish bishops, and have, on many occasions, addressed them by their titles. No, my Lord, I cannot impute to you the idea of having done all this, or joined in all this, freely and notoriously, with a conjunction of your opinion being in reality what it seems, that Popery is like to be the destruction of the Queen's authority in

this realm of England. Why, I would ask you, are you now denying both the words and the works of your whole life? Why put before the people these exciting things, to which your life gives the great answer,—They are not true? Why, my Lord, fondle and pet and nurse a viper which you knew would only sting you when it got sufficient warmth and vitality? If the Roman Catholics are dangerous, why did you foster them? If they are not dangerous, why do you say they are?

My Lord, you not only excite “the weak minds” of the people of England against Cardinal Wiseman and the Pope, and cry “no Popery”, but you do something more. While you say “Popery is dangerous, down with it”, you say—“It is not *my* fault, gentlemen. It is true I have always advocated their claims, and forwarded their views; but now that they have come out into power, that is not *my* fault; it is the fault of certain clergy within “our Church”. You couple yourself with *us*, although now a follower of Dr. Cumming, a Presbyterian. It suits you for your purpose to do so, and you do it. Knowing where the blame ought to lie, you turn it off, and say: “There, look at that,—look at these clergy,—look at their ‘mummeries’, and their ‘superstitions’,—observe these Roman doctrines, and their insidious teaching. These are the men that have caused this danger. Thus, under a masked battery, having diverted the attention from yourself, you aim your guns with too true an aim against us. Down with those clergy of ‘mutterings’, and of ‘confessions’, and of ‘infallibility’, and of ‘freedom from the queen’s supremacy’. These are the mischief-makers.” Then the mob is stirred and infuriated, and instead of the Roman Catholics themselves, *we* become the butts and objects of hatred, and ridicule, and violence. If there is a precipice at the end of a certain walk, and you know it, and dread it, and would not for the world move towards it, for fear of falling over it,—you would not hate the precipice; you would know of its existence, and simply avoid it. But if after a while, some one began to lead you towards it step by step,—and you went on under his guidance, as it were

fascinated, and bewildered,—when you should at length arrive at the precipice, and fall over, and thereby injure yourself,—with what kind of feeling would you look at such a guide?—hatred, wrath, repugnance, punishment. But this, my Lord, you have just done towards us, the clergy of S. Barnabas. You have told the whole Protestant world concerning the Roman Church, that it is the great enemy of the crown of Queen Victoria. You have saturated the people with the unchristian feeling of looking upon Rome with a sort of hatred, as though it were a natural enemy to England. Having signified this, you go to the bishop; and you say: See what the very bishop says. He speaks of these clergy as men “leading you step by step to this precipice.” What is to be done with them?

My Lord, you say this very adroitly under the cover of the bishop. But let me remind you, that if we, the clergy of S. Barnabas, are so very much to blame,—if it be really so, that we are leading the English Church to the Roman Church, and are therein (of course together with other brethren all over the country) of so much importance, in the danger of our tenets and practices,—if this be so, let me remind you, that it is only five months since the very bishop from whom you quote, came down among us, consecrated our church, gave us his blessing on our work, entered cordially into all our operations and plans for the good of the parish, and partook with rich and poor of a church-feast on our day of consecration, and made, at the dinner, before the assembled parish, this speech: it is so recorded in the *Morning Post* of June 13.

“As soon as the applause had subsided, the Bishop of London returned thanks. Before he proceeded to the pleasing duty assigned him by his friend Mr. Bennett, he was anxious to assure them, and he did so with the greatest sincerity, that he had experienced the highest gratification in coming among them on this occasion; and after the solemnities of the morning, by which a new house of prayer had been dedicated to the honour of God, he thought it was most fitting to preside at such an entertainment as this, where rich and poor were met together. He was glad to be with them there, not only because he saw the poor refreshing their bodies, and he hoped improving the tone of their minds by such enjoyment, many of them,

he regretted to think, not much abounding in the good things of this world ; but because he could not but regard such an assembly as a type of the Church itself, which provided a common feast for all without distinction. The Church, any more than its Divine Head, did not recognize any worldly distinctions, but offered to all alike the choicest blessings of the Gospel. His Lordship then paid a high compliment to Mr. Bennett, for his successful efforts to furnish so complete a provision for the spiritual wants of the neighbourhood, and expressed his earnest hope and confidence that the church and schools so munificently provided, would be the source of inestimable blessings to all around. He then addressed the four boys in affectionate terms, and formally admitted them to the foundation of the college. His Lordship was much cheered.

“The bishop then proposed, in glowing eulogy, the health of Mr. Bennett.”

Now, I can hardly think it possible that the bishop, after saying this, approving, as you see, cordially, and with “the greatest sincerity”, and with “the highest gratification”, of all he saw and all he joined in, should now mean to blame and censure those very same things. That would indeed be blowing hot and cold. In what or in whom could we ever trust, if that were the case ? I hold that the very idea of such a thing is an insult to the bishop. I will not believe it : there must be some delusion.

For remember all is just the same now as it was then ; we have not altered the church, or put anything therein which there was not before ; we sang our service with him, and he with us, in what your Lordship is pleased to call “muttering”, the same “muttering” which there is now ; we had all the same dress, the same font, the same Altar, and all belonging to it ; the same rood-screen, with its cross ; the same cross upon the Altar ; and all else. There are only two things since added, which I need not speak of here ; one, which is the acknowledged practice at S. Paul’s,* and known to the Bishop, the other commanded by the Church.† Yes. I may fairly say the whole spirit and tone, the intention, the mind of the whole church and college ; the foundation for the choristers, the masters, the mistresses, the curates, the general scheme and arrangement of the

* Flowers.

† Lights upon the altar. See Dr. Hook’s *Church Dictionary*.

whole; and yet still, moreover, as far as I myself am humbly concerned; my doctrine and way of teaching; my views and principles in the regulation of the service; my character as a priest; *intending* to do, teach, and pursue my way, in the very way I am now pursuing it. I repeat, all this was known to the Bishop. I know full well his kindness on that occasion. I believe fully that he sacrificed much on that occasion of his own private feelings and opinions as an individual; and I am filled (and all who know me will bear me witness how I have always expressed myself to this effect), with the greatest gratitude for the kindness of manner, and the paternal affection, with which the Bishop then treated me. And therefore it is that I cannot imagine that he should speak so harshly now. I believe then there is a delusion. The Bishop knows that I never can go back in the things I have said and done; that I can never from any fear of man, change, or recede from that which has been begun as *a principle*. I have told him that I cannot. That which he saw and knew then; that which he saw and blessed then; that which he knew to be my intention, and my mind then, in ceremonies and ritual; that shall it be now,—please God, and for ever the same, unchanged, unchangeable.

Therefore, my Lord, I fear you have done unjustly by S. Barnabas; I fear you have traduced our clergy here, by imputing false things to them. It cannot possibly be, that we are leading the people step by step over the precipice. How can we, when the Bishop led the way himself, in consecrating and blessing the Church which now you see?

But I have done with this point now. The sum is this. *You* say, the danger is in *us*; the fault on *our* shoulders. We say, not more so now than when our Bishop approved of all, and gave us our starting point. You say, that *we* are leading, step by step, our people over a precipice; meaning, of course, Rome. Let me ask you to read this little extract from the Bishop of Exeter's reply to the clergy at Plymouth. You will

there see what party in the Church *he* thinks are the leaders to Rome.

“If Romish principles have indeed prevailed, and still do prevail among any members of our Church—what has led to this most lamentable result?

“I will frankly state my own conviction, and will, as your Bishop, invite you, not to adopt it because it is mine, but to give it, on that account, your grave consideration. I believe, then, that to earnest-minded, intelligent, and reflecting men (as we must own many of those who have left us to be), the most effectual of all the inducements to abandon their loyalty to their Church, has been the wanton disregard of the principles of that Church, which is too often exhibited by many even of her clergy.

“For instance: when we see ministers of large and populous towns acting as if it were their main duty to raise, or keep alive, some ignorant prejudice, or to swell some low party-clamour among their people,—denying and calumniating, it may be, neighbouring ministers, more active, more zealous, and, therefore, more successful than themselves; limiting, meanwhile, their own services within the narrowest bounds—neglecting those plain directions of their Church which they have solemnly pledged themselves to fulfil—‘keeping holy’ none of the prescribed festivals in commemoration of Apostles, and saints, and martyrs—closing the House of God except on Sundays, as if among the countless thousands committed to their charge, there were none who are desirous of joining in the ‘Communion of Saints’ on any other day. Still worse, talking, and even teaching of the Church, which is the Body of Christ, as if it were an empty name; of His sacraments, as if they were mere ritual ordinances: of the whole wondrous and mysterious scheme devised by God’s wisdom and mercy for the restoration of fallen man, as if it were solely a matter of internal personal feeling. When, I repeat, we see and hear these things, we may condemn, we must lament, but we cannot wonder at the indignant impatience which has driven sensitive and earnest minds to seek, even in the corrupt system of Rome, something less unsatisfying than what they have been compelled to witness at home.”

There is something further which I have need to say about your Lordship’s consistency. Not your consistency in the political measures of your government, for of course with that subject, as a clergyman, I have nothing to do; nor your consistency in your own personal conduct and rule of faith, for of course the right of private judgment being in your own mind established as a necessary part of Protestantism, you only follow its dictates, in following your own will in regard to religious worship. But conceding, as I do, the right of

private judgment to you, I would ask, why will you not concede it to others?—why will you not concede it to me? It would seem but fair that a latitudinarian should give latitude to others; a free thinker, free thought; a free agent, free action; a liberal, liberality. But, as I have shewn, it is not so with you. What you impose on others, you do not impose on yourself; what you demand of others to be given to you, you are very reluctant indeed to give to them. But this principle, vicious and faulty as it is, is allowable, you might say—a *general*, a *political*, an *abstract* fault, and nothing to do with yourself. You perhaps try, as many politicians have done, to separate your political character from your personal, and you might say, it is very true I am an advocate for the right of private judgment, and civil and religious liberty, and so I would in my personal conduct abstain carefully from any measure or dealing with my neighbour, which would violate that principle; but as a statesman and a public servant of the constitution of my country, I am bound to adhere to that constitution; and finding, as I do, that the Church compels certain things of those who are her members, it is my duty to enforce her laws.

The truth of the matter is, that statesmen such as your Lordship, when they separate themselves into a public and a private character, immediately set up for themselves two opposite rules of conduct; and those opposite rules of conduct are the destruction of their consistency. The rule of conduct in private may perhaps be “the Word of God”, or “faith”, or “religion”; the rule of conduct in public is “Public Opinion”. While therefore in private, statesmen may possibly retain a tolerably consistent and harmonizing course, it is impossible that they can do so in public; because their rule is a shifting rule. As it is all-powerful, and subdues everything that comes in its way; so it is never the same two years together,—always varying, uncertain, contradicting itself, and therefore they who are under it, are always varying, and uncertain, and contradicting themselves. And yet it is impossible to

hold the reins of government and not bow down to it. So at least it appears. "What is the prevailing dominant temper of the national mind? Call it public opinion, or the spirit of the day, or the popular judgment, or the temper of the times, or the idea of the age, or the voice of the people, or fashion, or the ruling principle around us; in each alike we acknowledge the presence of a mysterious influence, shaping our thoughts and acts, controlling, overawing, resisting,—now laughing to scorn, now crushing with violence, now whispering and tempting us to silence, and now clamouring with all the noise of the people; but before which, as private individuals, we quail, and as citizens we own and even boast, that the governments of the earth must bow and obey."* Yes, my Lord, as a governor of this kingdom it is impossible for you to resist public opinion. You must either obey it, or you must cease to be the minister of our country. You prefer the former. Hence, though an advocate for Popery in your earlier life, you are its enemy now. "Catholic emancipation" was your cry formerly;—now, "No Popish Bishops", not seeing that the one is the natural and just development of the other. At the South Devon election, you were rejected as Secretary of the Home Department, because of your adherence to the side of "Popery". You have taken a lesson from that mischance, and are determined to maintain your place as Prime Minister on the opposite side of "No Popery". Public opinion compels you. It binds you down to its chariot-wheels, and hurries you hither and thither just as it will. You play into each other's hands, and, as it were, feed and sustain each other. Public opinion induces you to write to the Bishop of Durham; and then your letter is seized upon by Public Opinion as the vehicle for propagating itself. You are used as a kind of standard or sign of the people's will.

But whatever this may be in other men—however, in some cases it may be imagined that a politician can have two consciences, one for his country and one for

* Sewell—Sermons on the Spirit of the age.

himself,—I now desire to show, in your Lordship's case, that there is no such difficulty. You have been consistent, in being inconsistent in all ways—you have not as a statesman been now deriding and destroying what before you praised and fondled, and that alone—but, as far as regards the matter now in hand, (for you will remember that I write this letter as a parish priest to his parishioner) you have done the very same in your parochial connexion with our poor church of S. Barnabas. I wish, my Lord, to remind you of this, and to expostulate as gently as I may with the fact of a sudden and unaccountable aversion where before there was at least some degree of toleration and countenance.

In the year 1843, the Church of S. Paul, Knightsbridge, was consecrated by the Bishop of London. You being a parishioner, became from the very first a member of the congregation therein worshipping; you were constantly at Divine Service, constantly at sermons, you have received the Holy Sacrament, you and yours, at my hands. You must therefore have been aware of my teaching in the pulpit, must have been aware of the system or party in the Church to which we were attached (for, my Lord, it is of no use to disguise the fact that there *are* parties in the Church). You must have been aware of all this, and yet there you remained for the period nearly of seven years.

Moreover, being one of our chief parishioners, you generously contributed subscriptions to our parish schools, and all other charitable institutions devised for the use of the poor. In private also, according as the need arose, you have more than once, unsolicited and of a kind sympathy with the needs of our poor, sent me private sums of money for their benefit; you have frequently accompanied these gifts with remarks of your own concerning the way in which you would desire them to be used, all showing such a spirit of charity and fellowship with us, as induced us to think, that neither our public teaching nor our private pastoral works could be altogether unacceptable to you.

In course of time, among other pastoral duties, we devised the scheme of building a new church. When the idea was first set forth that this very church from which I am now writing, and which unhappily has drawn down on our heads such hatred and bitterness of spirit,—this very church, against which, among others, if not principally, your Lordship's language, in your letter to the Bishop of Durham, is levelled,—when this project for the good of our poor brethren was set forth, you most generously were among the first to contribute of your alms for its advancement. And not only this, my Lord. It was not the chance or careless gift of one who thought not of what he was doing; it was not money thrown down and left, as it might chance, to be fruitful, or not; but you were so good as to enter into the details of the plan. It was at Christmas 1846, being then at Woburn, that you wrote to me concerning this matter. You had been at church the Sunday preceding, and there had been an offertory, being Ember Week, for the Curates' Fund. In your letter you enclosed an alms-gift for that purpose, and then entered into details concerning the new church. You were so good as to propose a specific plan of your own; which had, indeed, some advantages in it, but we thought not on the whole advisable. Though I could not agree with you in the idea which you suggested, still I was very thankful for your expression of sympathy, and specially as it manifested the fact, that the good work, intended to be done, had been a matter of consideration with you. In that letter you go on to speak of the new church in these words:

“ Will you permit me to say, that if I understood you rightly, the seats of S. Barnabas are to be all free seats; I think you are mistaken in not requiring some small payment (say sixpence a month) for at least half of them. I believe they would be more valued, and the money might be spent in keeping the seats clean and warming the church.”

My Lord, you can hardly imagine how gratified I was at the reception of that letter. I was so pleased to think that you could, in the midst of your laborious occupations, have been able to give our little church of

S. Barnabas even a thought; and I wrote, in reply, that our idea was to make the church entirely free and open, on the ancient principle of churches, leaving the payments, necessary for the maintenance of the fabric, to the voluntary offerings of the people, which would be made at the offertory. But this by the way. My object in reminding you of this letter, is to identify you with myself, and S. Paul's, and S. Barnabas', in knowledge, if not in spirit; to shew that at that time you fully entered into the system of the church which I advocated; that you did not object to my teaching; that you had no fault to find with my general principles and views. Could I at that time have been among those "insidious" persons whom you now would have the people to destroy, and get rid of? And yet there has been no change whatsoever. It is all the same. The same ecclesiastical system; the same line of preaching; the same "mode of worship"; the same ritual, and ceremonial observances. I would ask, then, is it consistent of your Lordship, is it kind, now to persecute that which before you took part in? Have I done anything (as far as my poor flock of S. Barnabas is concerned) to merit such an utter change of feeling and of sentiment, as now appears in your letter and speech. Last spring you joined in our worship at S. Paul's. This autumn, not so much as six months after, you say of certain of the clergy, among whom, your description will of necessity include myself; you say of them, that you have little hope that they will "desist from their insidious course"; that course containing, in your estimation, "a greater danger than the aggression of a foreign sovereign". Is this quite fair?

But, my Lord, let me go on a little further. So late as the year 1849, at our anniversary festival of S. Barnabas, you were so kind as to say that you would come and take part, personally, in our festivities. You were to do this as a parishioner, together with your colleague, the Earl of Carlisle. When the day came, the unexpected summoning of a Cabinet Council prevented you

(you wrote to me to say so); and at the dinner that day, the Earl of Carlisle spoke as follows:—

“ He begged to return his best thanks to Mr. Bennett and his fellow-parishioners for their kind notice of the nobility, and of himself personally as one of that order. His first words ought to be those of regret for the unavoidable absence of his fellow-parishioner, and his colleague in another capacity, Lord John Russell. That noble lord had wished and intended to be present, and he had commissioned him (Lord Carlisle) to express his deep regret that very pressing business prevented him coming among them on so interesting an occasion. He only wished that Lord John Russell had been present to have witnessed the gratifying scene before them (cheers). For his own part, he would briefly state what had brought him there at the sacrifice of time which he could ill spare from public duties. He had come as an inhabitant of the district in which such great things were being done for the highest happiness of the people. He had come to countenance a great work of charity, and to look with interest on such a heart-stirring scene, where rich and poor were met together at the festive board (cheers). He had come also as a parishioner to express his warmest admiration of the untiring industry, and the unbounded zeal, of Mr. Bennett as their pastor. Allusion had been made to the possibility of differences existing between them. He knew of none which could prevent him co-operating heartily with Mr. Bennett in his pious and charitable exertions for the good of the people committed to his charge; and he had come there, he repeated, to express his highest admiration of the immense practical good which Mr. Bennett was doing, more especially among the poor (cheers).”—*Morning Post*, June 14, 1849.

So far then as S. Barnabas' day 1849, there was no diminution of agreement, and countenance, to a certain extent, of the tone and principles of worship in S. Paul's church. I say, to a certain extent, because no doubt with all the external and apparent agreement, it would be very possible that points of internal disagreement lurked beneath. It would be very possible that all you had done and said were merely the demonstrations of a kind heart, wishing, although you did not agree, not to manifest anything, on your part, of open hostility. It might have been a desire not to kindle strife, not to sow the seeds of disunion in a congregation,—to show the example of a parishioner, duly attending his parish church: or it might have been (which I hope sincerely it was *not*) that you were like Gallio, and cared for none of these things, desiring to let them take their course. But this, for the reasons just given, I do not think could

have been the case. At any rate, be it either one or the other of these causes, there could not have been anything so very severely wrong in me, as to justify the expression contained in your letter, in 1850, when in 1849 you were willing to take open part in the charitable works of my parish with me and for me. If my course was insidious, why did you take part in that course? If I so muttered the liturgy, as to disguise its language,—why did you join in so glaring a profaneness for nearly seven years? If I practised “mummeries and superstition”,—why did you come to join in them for nearly seven years? Why did you so far and so deeply join in them, as to receive, at my hands, so late as Ash Wednesday 1849, the Holy Eucharist, yourself and your family? If I were one of those designated in your letter as bringing a greater danger than even the Pope, why then, my Lord, was it, that you said not all this before? Why, for seven years,—not occasionally, remember, or as a stranger, but in your place as a regular parishioner—why, by external acts of union and participation in what was being done—why by this participation manifested in the deepest mystery of our faith, did you signify to the world (as far as such things can be signified) your agreement essentially in all that was done? If you really thought that your soul, and the souls of your family, were likely to be enslaved, and their intellects confined, why place yourself and yours within a sphere of religious teaching, which was tending towards that end? Or if you feared not for yourself, as being too strong to heed it, why countenance it by your own example in regard of others who were weak? why tend towards, and co-operate with, a system which was likely to be so pernicious and so fatal to their spiritual welfare? And lastly, my Lord, why in the midst of all this (if it were so) “insidious teaching”, “mummeries of superstition”, and “leading of the flock to the verge of the precipice”,—why did you lend your countenance and give your alms, not only to the maintenance and support of that system as then established at one church, but also to the building and establishment of another,

which you knew would be conducted on the very same principles? Why, not only look on, and bear with, and take part in, such a profane and wicked perversion of truth as I must really have been guilty of, if your words are true, with a passive or acquiescent permission—but *join* publicly and actively in its propagation and extension. Either, my Lord, you and myself must have been wilfully, and grossly, and wickedly wrong for seven years, or we were right,—and only mistaken, or misunderstood. If the former, how awful must be our case before the Living GOD, at the great day of judgment,—tampering with holy things, receiving of His blessed sacraments, joining in His holy ordinances, presuming to stand before Him, and invoke His holy name in prayer,—and all the while, imagining that we were doing no more than a “mummery”, and believing no more than a “superstition.” If the latter, why have you given up what you once approved, or at least assented to? why have you abandoned what you were content to practise? why have you denounced what you helped to advance and to increase.

I should like now, my Lord, to say a few words on the subject of your theology. You invite me to do so in your letter to the Bishop of Durham, by the very marked manner in which you couple certain points of divinity and ecclesiastical usage with the danger you say you apprehend from certain “clergymen of our own Church”. You say that this is a danger which “alarms you”. And then you speak of the Thirty-nine Articles—the Queen’s Supremacy—the honour paid to Saints—the claim of infallibility for the Church—the superstitious use of the cross—the muttering of the Liturgy so as to disguise the language in which it is written—the recommendation of auricular confession, and the admission of penance and absolution. All these points having been mentioned in order, you go on to say that those who teach and practise such things are “unworthy sons of the Church of England”, you call their course “insidious”; you hope the nation will look with contempt

on their “mummeries of superstition”. And these are the grounds upon which you say that they are making ‘laborious endeavours’ to confine the intellect and to enslave the soul”.

After such language as this, I do not wonder, my Lord, at the mob thinking the same things and acting thereupon. You designate me among others as “unworthy”, “insidious”—imputing motives. You say it is a “laborious endeavour”, imputing system and an object; the object meant being, to induce our flocks to join the Church of Rome. You say “we lead our flocks to the very verge of a precipice”, the precipice being Rome. You call what we do, “superstition”, and a “mummery”. Mummery is defined by Dr. Johnson to be “foolery”. It is “playing the fool in a mask”. It very nearly means the same thing as histrionic or acting. And this is what you deliberately charge a clergyman with being and doing, under whose ministrations you were content to abide for seven years. What could I not say to you, my Lord, if I were not restrained by the decency and temper which it becomes a Christian clergyman to use even towards those who are most averse and opposed to him? I will not speak as I might, but I will pass over all that suggests itself to me, as to the spirit with which you have entered on these religious topics—as to the good taste of a Prime Minister of England entering upon religious controversy, and taking a part in religious strife of tongues—as to the wisdom of your throwing yourself thus open to the imputation of some motive of *politics* lying behind all that you say—as to the impossibility from your education, your political habits and your present laborious office—the impossibility of your sufficiently understanding the subject upon which you so dogmatically pronounce. All this I will pass over; but I must, of course, in defence of myself, explain to your Lordship, and through your Lordship to my flock, and others concerned in what you have said, the total fallacy of the idea which you seem to have formed about Church matters, and the strange perversions, and distortions, with which you have overloaded the reality of the case. I must do this as a

matter of defence, because I am bound for their sakes to protest to them that, however “unworthy a son of the Church” I may be, still I am not “insidious”, that I am not given “to play the fool in a mask”, or given to “acting” in the things of God; that I am not so laborious as to try in the nineteenth century, with all the learning, and wisdom, and books, which now are the property of all, “to confine their intellects and enslave their souls”.

The first religious topic you mention is, “the honour paid to Saints”. I was not aware that there was anything specially remarkable in any of the clergy of the Church of England paying honour to Saints. I thought the very dedication of our churches was “paying them honour”, seeing every church in England is either named after the Holy Trinity, or some Saint or Angel of GOD’s invisible Church. I thought, too, that it was a well known thing that a great portion of the Book of Common Prayer was occupied in “honouring Saints”, seeing that the calendar is full of their names, with special days and services set apart for each, and seeing that the clergy are directed to announce the recurrence of those days to the people in order that they may be kept holy. All this, I thought, was very well known, and hardly needed now any further explanation. I should indeed desire for you, my Lord, that you would, as a member of my parish, escape from the teaching of Dr. Cumming, in regard to this point of honour paid to Saints; because I believe that the Presbyterians deny all idea of that great doctrine, which the Catholic Church has always faithfully clung to,—namely, “the communion of Saints”. I understand that they never imagine it necessary to record, or commemorate, or hold communion with in prayer or otherwise, any portion of the Church triumphant in heaven; that it is a part of divinity entirely ignored by them. I wish your Lordship would put yourself once more under the teaching of our Church, and then you would learn, very much to your spiritual comfort, how glad a thing it is to look with faith, with reverence, and with honour, to the joyful

company of martyrs and Apostles, and the blessed Virgin Mother of our Lord, and all holy men and holy women of every age and place, whom the Apostle S. Paul himself designates, "the spirits of just men made perfect". The *Directory* indeed says: "There is no day commanded in Scripture to be kept holy under the Gospel, but the Lord's day, which is the Christian's Sabbath". Would your Lordship have us to return to the *Directory* and cast away the Prayer Book? If not, let us follow the Prayer Book, as that follows all primitive antiquity, in honouring Saints. In the Communion Service, in the prayer for the Church militant, in any of the collects for the Saints' days, and also the Burial Service, you will readily find this doctrine. It is all founded on the ancient fathers, as the use of the Church coming directly from the Apostles. It is founded on what S. Augustin says: "We honour the memory of Saints, as of holy men of GOD, who contended for the truth even unto death. By that honour we offer GOD thanks for their victories, and encourage ourselves by the refreshing of our memory, to the imitation of their crowns".* And what would you think, to go from ancient to modern, what would you think of Dr. Arnold? He, at least, was no special favourer either of Romanism, or of the English portion of the Church, as you describe it; and yet it is said of him by his biographer: "The touching recollections of those among the living and the dead, whom he had loved or revered, which passed through his mind as he talked of All Saints' Day, and its accompanying feast, now no longer observed, All Souls' Day, might have escaped a careless observer."†

Yes, my Lord, sweet is the memory of the dead, we will not pass it by; and joyful the honour of the saints in Christ. Their lives let us imitate, and we shall be less of the world; their holy actions let us follow, and we shall be nearer God; their sufferings and labours let

* S. August. De civitate Dei, viii. 27.

† Life and Correspondence, i. p. 154.

us take part in when we can, and in Christ, and for Christ, we shall win their crowns.

Your next topic, my Lord, is "*The Infallibility of the Church*". Here, again, I plead guilty to your charge. I *do* claim for the Church infallibility. I have always taught this; and I now desire to tell you *why* I have taught it. I think that infallibility is essentially necessary for the very existence of a Church; that any article of faith, vital to salvation, depends necessarily upon it; that without it, we have nothing certain to believe at all. But in what sense; and how? I do not believe there is infallibility in the *English* Church, or in any particular *national* Church: our Articles of Religion expressly say that there is no such infallibility; that all national Churches are liable to err. But national Churches are not the CATHOLIC CHURCH. It is the whole, universal, Catholic Church, throughout all ages, and in all countries, and in all times agreeing, and blessed by the Spirit of GOD, as the Apostles were at Pentecost—it is *this* Church, the Church of the living GOD, of Christ Jesus our Lord, that is expressly called in Holy Scripture, "the pillar and ground of the Truth". For let me put it to you, my Lord, in the simplest way, just for illustration. You are quite certain that the book of the Gospel of S. John is an inspired book; that it is really the Word of GOD; that it is written by the Evangelist with the gift of the Holy Ghost. This you *must* believe, otherwise you deny the Holy Scriptures, and are worse than an infidel. But on what ground do you believe it? How do you know anything about it of yourself? How can you prove that S. John wrote that Gospel at all; and if he did, how do you know that he was inspired, or wrote the truth, or that the words you read are his words,—that there is no interpolation, or mistake, or error in them? How can you or I possibly know about this of ourselves? We cannot. We only believe it, because the Church tells us so; because the Church examined into it, tested its authority, genuineness, and inspiration, and then pronounced it to be so. Now, if the Church be not INFALLIBLE, any one

at his pleasure might set up his own criticism to dispute it—might openly say, I believe not a word of it ; but if the Church be infallible, we have a certain ground for our belief in that Holy Book. And what applies to the one book, applies similarly to all. Your faith rests upon Holy Scripture; Holy Scripture must be true. You can only know that it is true upon the infallibility of the Church, which has pronounced it to be so, and handed it down to you. In proportion as you take away the infallibility of the Church, you take away the certainty of the Holy Scriptures ; and in proportion as you take away the Holy Scriptures, you destroy your own faith in Jesus Christ, by which you hope to be saved. Without this idea, I see no resting-place any where, for any doctrine or for any practice ; no certainty for any thing that we read, see, or imagine in the whole wide groundwork of our salvation. We become at once rationalists ; and from rationalists, sceptics ; and from sceptics, infidels. We are without a guide, without a pilot, without a hope, without a light, without a faith ; but with it, we see, acknowledge, are assured, embrace Christ in faith, and die in Him with confidence. We see then the meaning of the most wonderful and gracious saying : “ The Holy Ghost, whom I will send, He shall guide you unto all truth”. “ Lo, I am with you always unto the end of the world !” “ Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

I must say this then, my Lord, that were I to tell you, that the Church of Christ is *fallible*, I should tell you that you have no grounds for being a Christian ; that were I to say you need NOT “ *confine your intellect*” in this faith, but let it wander whithersoever it might lead you,—you would become an Atheist in a few months, as so many have, or, at least, a free thinker and a sceptic ; and then indeed fearfully, most fearfully would your soul be “ enslaved” ;—not by me, but by *him* who is ever wandering about seeking whom He may devour ; by that dreadful tempter and destroyer of souls, whom GOD permits, for their chas-

tisement, to take men captive at his will. Do not, my Lord, mistake what I say. Clearly understand, honestly consider it. Which doctrine is it that enslaves your soul? His, who would end in making you an infidel; or His, who would lead you in peace and comfort to a firm repose and rest in the Holy Scriptures, your ground-work, your rock, your stay, your confidence, your assurance of salvation?

Next to the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Church, you mention "*the sign of the cross*", and you call it superstitious. I do not suppose you mean to make any distinction between a superstitious sign of the cross, and a sign not superstitious; because if you only mean that, of course we grant your charge at once. Anything superstitious, as such, is of course objectionable. Superstitious prayers, superstitious reception of sacraments, superstitious reading of the Bible, as far as it is superstitious, is of course wrong; but take away the superstition, and then the thing itself is right. This you would readily grant. But what you mean no doubt is this, that *all* use of the sign of the cross is superstitious. If so, then you go against the Church, which commands it at the font in baptism. I myself will freely confess to you, that I highly delight in that holy sign. I have long been accustomed to use it on all great occasions, and in all holy places, and recommend it to others. If persons will take offence at it, they must remember Him whose sign it is, and learn better. I use the holy sign, not for superstition, but in token that I am not ashamed "to confess the faith of Christ crucified, but hope manfully (with GOD'S grace) to fight under that banner against sin, the world, and the devil." It seems to come so naturally, and so gracefully from the baptismal font. It seems so beautiful and simple a type of our love of our blessed Saviour. It seems so called for in this present age of unbelief and worldliness. It seems so hallowing and purifying an invocation of His presence, and of the atonement by which we are saved, that in the first instance, viewed abstractedly and without prejudice,—where the true

Christian could be found to object to it, it is beyond me to imagine. I can conceive a Socinian, or a Deist, or a Unitarian, or some violent heretic of that kind, to object both to the name of the Holy Trinity and the Cross of Jesus, both its doctrine and its sign; but how an orthodox Christian can object (always setting aside *prejudice*), I am quite at a loss to understand. In Bishop Grindall's Articles of Visitation, it is said: "No persons are allowed to wear beads.....nor superstitiously to make the sign of the Cross when they enter the church"; upon which Collier remarks: "But supposing they did not do these things *superstitiously*, it is possible they might not come within the censure of the Article."—Collier, part II. b. vi. There may be an allowed distinction between doing a thing *superstitiously*, and doing it with a pure and devotional mind. Why should it be of necessity *superstitious*? Edward VI and Elizabeth both used the sign of the Cross in touching for the king's-evil—both good Protestants. L'Estrange, in his *Alliance of Divine Offices*, mentions it with approval. Our own Canons speak of it as permissible (30th of 1603). At the end of Edward VI's first Prayer-Book, I find this note: "As touching kneeling, crossing, holding up of hands, knocking upon the breast, and other gestures, they may be used or left, as any man's devotion serveth, without blame." And it may be observed that nothing in subsequent editions of the Prayer-Book has ever contradicted this. What we want is to get rid of *puritanical prejudice*, and to judge of matters intrinsically of themselves. I believe your Lordship is a great admirer of the writings of Dr. Arnold, whom indeed I quoted before concerning honour paid to saints. If you will turn to the life of that eminent man, lately published, vol. 1, you will find that he was an advocate not for the Cross only, but for the Crucifix. "The second commandment", he says, "is in the letter utterly done away with by the fact of the Incarnation. To refuse, then, the benefit which we might derive from the *frequent use of the Crucifix*, under the pretence of the second commandment, is a

folly, because God has sanctioned one conceivable similitude of Himself, when He declared Himself in the person of Christ." In another place, he says : " I like the simple crosses and oratories by the road side" (vol. II. p. 362). Again, he says :—

1. " The open churches, the varied services, the beautiful solemnities, the processions, the Calvaries, the crucifixes, the appeals to the eye and ear through which the heart is reached most effectually, have no natural connexion with superstition."—*Life and Corresp.* II. 395.

2. " In the crypt is a calvary and figures as large as life, representing the burying of our Lord. The woman who showed us the crypt, had her little girl with her ; and she lifted up the child, about three years old, to kiss the feet of our Lord. Is this idolatry? Nay, verily, it may be so, but it need not be, and assuredly is in itself right and natural. I confess I rather envied the child. It is idolatry to talk about holy church and holy fathers—bowing down to fallible and sinful men; not to bend knee, lip and heart, to every thought, and every image of Him our manifested God."—p. 402.

3. " We found the afternoon service going on at the cathedral, and the archbishop, with his priests and the choristers, were going round the church in procession, chaunting some of their hymns, and with a great multitude of people following them. The effect was very fine; and I again lamented our neglect of our cathedrals, and the absurd confusion in so many minds between what is really popery and what is but wisdom and beauty, adopted by the Roman Catholics, and neglected by us."—p. 434.

You spoke, my Lord, at the Guildhall Dinner of a good princess, Queen Elizabeth. You say—" When perils much more grave, much more imminent, impended over this country, a wise princess, who at that time ruled our destinies, thought fit to call to her aid all those, whatever might be their religious persuasions, who were faithful to the throne and true to the interests of their country. Such was the conduct of Queen Elizabeth in times of as great danger as ever occurred in this country". What kind of danger does this allude to? Coupled with the context and the general run of the speech, the danger must be on the ground of religion, the differences then struggling on between the Pope and the Queen, which ended in her excommunication. Well then, this danger of religious freedom—this Papal aggression—this precipice over which Queen Elizabeth's Protestant subjects were in danger

of being led—was the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. That is plainly your Lordship's meaning. Now turn to Neal's History of the Puritans, and you will find from him that this wise princess "had a crucifix in her chapel, with images of the Blessed Virgin and S. John. The gentlemen and singing children appeared in surplices, and the priests in their copes. The altar was furnished with rich plate and two gilt candlesticks, with lighted candles, and a massy crucifix of silver in the midst. The service was sung, not only with the sound of organs, but with the artificial music of cornets, sackbuts, etc. etc." Now Queen Elizabeth, you told us, my Lord, was a wise princess, a good Protestant, and a friend of religious liberty.

The next topic is "*The muttering of the Liturgy so as to disguise the language in which it is written*".

I hardly know how to reply to this, for it would seem an accidental defect either in the voice of the ministering clergyman, or the ear of your Lordship. He might not perhaps articulate clearly, or you hear clearly. But if you mean more than the accident—if you mean that we "mutter" with a purpose, and that purpose is "to disguise the language"—then I must ask your Lordship what this means. To *disguise*, is "to conceal by an unusual dress"—"to hide by a counterfeit appearance"—see Dr. Johnson. What is it then that we hide or conceal? The English language, and with what dress or counterfeit do we so hide it? It probably could be said, by the *Latin* language, that being the language of the Roman Communion—our point of danger. Now, if this really be the idea of our "muttering", it would indeed be "mummery", or "playing under a mask", or "acting", or any other of the accusations brought against us. But it cannot surely mean so great an absurdity as this; if not, then there can only be one other meaning possible, the concealing or hiding the language altogether under sound, mere sound, musical or otherwise. It is then said (for remember, to disguise, conveys an act with a *purpose*), that we use the choral or musical, or cathedral form of service

in order to hide or conceal what we say, by music. But suppose you say, "I did not mean a *purposed* but only an *accidental* hiding or concealing". Then we are thrown back on the more ordinary arguments for the cathedral and choral form of divine service. And then it becomes a matter of private taste, private like, or dislike, a matter of suitableness one way or another, and not a matter of principle. If so, all about our being "insidious", a "mummery", or "acting", falls to the ground. For we do no more than the cathedrals all through England do, in principle recognized and acknowledged, a principle handed down to us by the Reformation in express terms, a principle coming from God Himself in the Jewish worship, and blessed to us by our Lord and the Apostles therein participating, and made of full, and of undoubted authority by the Fathers of the Church from the first century down to the present. Let us reflect with S. Chrysostom whether the fault of not hearing, be, not on the singer, but the hearer. It is easy to say the word "*muttering*"—may not the fault be in the heart within, which does not attune itself to the divine melodies of the Catholic worship—S. Chrysostom's words are these—

"But what do the multitude say? 'I do not hear what is read,' saith one, 'nor do I hear what the words are which are spoken.' Because thou makest a tumult and confusion, because thou comest not with a *reverent soul*. What sayest thou? 'I know not what things are said.' Well then for this very reason thou oughtest to give heed. . . . In truth, there ought to be but one voice in the church always, as there is but one body. He who chants, chants alone; and though all utter the responses, the voice is wafted as from *one mouth*."—S. Chrys. Hom. on Cor. xxxvi, 9.

And there is another authority which I am fond of quoting when I can,—one more near your Lordship's own ideas as to many points, but strangely differing in more,—I mean Dr. Arnold. You have heard his opinions about the use of the cross, and the crucifix,—now hear what he says concerning the Choral Service:—

"How visible was the animation with which by force of long association he joined in the musical parts of the service, to which *he was by nature wholly indifferent*, as in the chanting of the Nicene Creed, which was adopted in accordance with his conviction that creeds in

public worship (Sermon III. 310) ought to be used as triumphant hymns of thanksgiving; or still more in the 'Te Deum', which he loved so dearly, and when his whole countenance would be lifted up at his favourite verse, 'When Thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, Thou didst open the kingdom of heaven to all believers.'"

I think I need hardly argue the matter of the Choral Service *now*. There are so many works on the subject, easily within your Lordship's reach. You ought to read them, before you judge those who simply follow the Church's authority. You ought, indeed, to be more careful of bringing accusations, before you are sure of your ground. But I would recommend, *Jebb's Choral Service* and *La Trobe on the Music of the Church*. I have said a few words myself, in *Lectures on the Book of Common Prayer*. (See the last chapter.)

But I must come to the next topic of your accusation, which is somewhat more important,—it regards Auricular Confession, Penance, and Absolution. They all go somewhat more or less together, and they form, I do acknowledge, a very material feature in the organization and discipline of the Church.

In explanation of this, and in deprecation of a premature judgment of things you could hardly well be supposed to understand, I would ask your Lordship simply to turn to your Prayer Book, at the service for Ash Wednesday. I remember that in one of our more happy years, and when I was not considered among the "insidious", that you were at church at S. Paul's on an Ash Wednesday. It was Ash Wednesday 1849.

My lord, I was always anxious, most anxious, as a pastor of Christ, set over you 'in the Lord's congregation of which you were a member,—I was always most anxious, secretly within myself, for your spiritual welfare and salvation. This cannot, I hope, be charged against me, as any attempt at self-glorification, or claiming more in my duties than was required of me. Our duty is so very imperative, to "watch for the souls" of the flock committed to our keeping: I state the mere fact, that when I could not help seeing you as I did continually before me, subject to my teaching, hearing the elucidation of Gospel truths, and the Church's authority from my mouth, and joining in

prayer and sacraments from time to time—I state the mere fact—that a peculiar and awful sense of responsibility was felt to be kindled within. It seemed as if great things might have been depending on the rightness of my teaching, and that the Church in Her real beauty, and magnificence, and truth, might be lost or not lost, by some mistake or want of judgment on my part. I knew your temptations and dangers. I felt for you in the awful responsibilities of your high office, as the chief ruler of our country. I feared for you, and I prayed for you. I would never have told this, as now I do, but for the special and awful crisis which has, through your principal instrumentality, been brought about. But this now I will tell, known before only to GOD, that frequently, very frequently in the lone night, and when you have been labouring in the House of Commons, I have been in the church where you worshipped, and by name (of course with others of my flock according to their needs) have invoked the Almighty GOD of nations, that He would vouchsafe to guide your policy for our country's welfare, and our Church's blessing. Yes, often have I prayed specially in your behalf,—often have I specially sought of GOD, that I might have grace in preaching, to win you to the deeper truths of our most holy faith. I say this now, because at such a time it was—I mean in the year 1849—so late as Ash Wednesday 1849,—I find a note in my journal, thus: “Lord and Lady John Russell at the Holy Communion this day. This looks well. Oh, that we could make them love the Church!” I give you, my Lord, the very genuine simple words of my private journal, such words of course never expecting to see the light. But there they are, and I give them to you to shew you how I felt then, and how rejoiced I was, on such a day, at such a time, to see the testimony of your faith, your repentance, and your love.

But what has all this to do, you will say, with Auricular Confession and Penance? Why this much; that on that day, you did hear and join in that solemn Service of the Church which is called “the Communion Service”; and in that Service you heard these

words: "Brethren, in the Primitive Church there was a godly discipline, that at the beginning of Lent, such persons as stood convicted of notorious sin, were put to open penance, and punished in this world, that their souls might be saved in the day of the Lord, and that others, admonished by their example, might be more afraid to offend. Until whereof (until the said discipline may be restored again, which is much to be wished), it is thought good", etc. The idea of Penance is, then, held in the Church of England as a thing desirable.

With regard to Auricular Confession, and absolution by the priest, you will see the doctrine of the Reformed Church clearly set forth in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. When the priest exhorts his parishioners to the Holy Communion, he does so in the following words:—

"And if there bee any of you, whose conscience is troubled or grieved in any thing, lacking comfort or counsaill, let him come to me, or to some other dyscreete and learned priest, taught in the law of GOD, and confesse and open his synne and grieffe secretly, that he maye receive such ghostly counsaill, advyse and comfort, that his conscience may be relieved, and that of us (as of the ministers of GOD and of the Church) he may receive comfort and absolution, to the satisfacion of his mynde, avoyding of all scruple and doubtfulness: requiryng such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not to be offended with them that doe use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest: nor those also which think nedefull or convenient, for the quietness of their owne consciences, particularly to open their sinnes to the priest, to bee offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to GOD, and the generall confession to the Church. But in all thinges to followe, and kepe the rule of charitie, and every man to be satisfied with his owne conscience, not judging other men's myndes or consciences, whereas he hath no warrant of GODDE'S Word to the same."

In our present Communion office, the words are these, somewhat modified, but conveying the same essential meaning:—

"If there be any of you, who by this means [self-examination and confession to GOD] cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, let him come to me, or some other discreet and learned minister of GOD'S Word, and open his grief, that by the ministry of GOD'S Holy Word he may receive the benefit of Absolution," etc. etc.

In the office of Visitation of the Sick, your Lordship will find that the priest visiting "the sick person" is plainly directed, as a necessary part of his duty, to "move him to a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter; after which confession, the priest shall absolve him, if he humbly and heartily desire it, after this sort." Upon which Dean Comber remarks thus: "To confess our sins to a priest, even in health, is a pious and ancient custom, and not only a sign of repentance, but the best means for obtaining pardon, and for amending our lives," etc. etc. And let me ask you, my Lord, carefully to look at the form of Absolution:—

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, Who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences. And by His authority, committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

To cite to you all that is said by the divines of the Church of England on this head, would be absurd in such a letter as this. And to refer you to the fathers of the early Church, to explain its doctrine and practice, would be even more absurd. Sufficient it is for me to call your attention to the fact, that confession to a priest (commonly called auricular confession) is advocated, and pronounced useful, by the English Church. The only difference you will observe between the Church of Rome and ourselves being this, that Rome makes such confession absolutely necessary for salvation; the other leaves it as a voluntary act, to be used, or not used, according to the spiritual needs of the penitent. If your Lordship could but follow the simple teaching of Edward VI's first Prayer Book, to the effect that auricular confession was to be left to each man's own conscience; he that used it, not to be judged of him that did not use it; he that did not use it, not to be judged of him that did use it; then we should, indeed, have very little difficulty with each other. If you find fault with those clergy who do, for the comfort of penitent souls, receive their confessions when tendered; if you find

fault with them for going to the priest in difficulties, and when they cannot find their own way out of conscientious scruples, and misgivings of sin; if you find fault with priestly absolution, and the announcement made to sinners that they may repent, and be saved; then you find fault not with the clergy, but with the Prayer Book; not with *me*, my Lord, but the Church. Your better rule had been, since these holy things always suffer by the conversation of the world, not to have thrust forward this subject so rudely. The rule of the English Church is clear. A distinction is to be drawn between *forced* auricular confession and *voluntary* auricular confession; allowing the one to belong to the Church of Rome, the other, to ourselves. And I would remind you further, my Lord, of one little circumstance which ought to have weight in considering the subject; I would remind you of the charge and jurisdiction conveyed to the priest as affecting this very point: "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained"; taken, as you remember, from the mouth of our Lord, and applied in the Ordination, as an essential and distinctive mark of the office of a priest.

I would remark to you further, that the custom of auricular confession derived from this, both in doctrine and in practice, is clearly deducible all through the Reformation, down to our own days. Archbishop Cranmer says that it is "very useful, and highly necessary".* Erasmus advocates it; saying among other things: "The penitent, by laying the state of his conscience before a priest, is better acquainted with the degrees of his guilt, and the danger of his miscarriage".† Of Bishop Ridley it is said by Collier—"As to auricular confession to a priest, he always looked upon it as a very serviceable usage, that by this expedient the penitent might be instructed, reprov'd, and comforted".‡ The visitation articles of Bishops Overall, Andrewes,

* Cranmer's Works, iv. p. 281.

† Erasmus, Exomologesis, seu modus confitendi.

‡ Collier, part II. book v.

Montague, Wren, Gunning, all are cast in the same mould, and are founded on the Exhortation in the Communion Office and the Canons of 1604—for instance, Bishop Gunning. He inquires whether any person, especially before receiving Holy Communion, doth, for the quieting of his conscience, unburden his conscience to his priest, and doth the said priest, upon special confession of sins made, together with fruits meet for repentance.....administer to him *absolution*.* Here we have the whole three points of the present charge against us set forth in order. Confession, penance, absolution. Bishop Cosin says—“Among the precepts of the Church, to receive the Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ with frequent devotion, and three times a year at least, of which Easter to be always one. And for better preparation—to disburden and quiet our consciences of those sins that may grieve us,” etc.† Bishop Taylor also—“That having made choice of such a confessor who is every way qualified, that you may trust your soul with him, you are advised plainly and sincerely to open your heart to him”. “That for frequency of doing this, you are to consult with your own necessities”.‡

This testimony might be augmented a hundred-fold, but this I should presume sufficient for proof of what the English Church holds and teaches concerning auricular confession. It is so very simple and so very charitable, that I cannot bring myself to consider that you would have found fault with the clergy in this practice, had you known the real state of the case. I have incurred, I am aware, much odium—I have lost, I know, the affections and confidence of many, by openly stating the Church’s doctrine and rule in this matter. It is very unpopular to the Protestant ear. There is hardly any thing so identified with Rome. Nevertheless what is truth must be said, and this consolation always attaches to it, namely that one penitent in his repent-

* Quoted from Dr. Pusey—Letter to Mr. Richards, p. 117, for which see further proofs.

† Idem, p. 123.

‡ Idem, p. 127.

ance and confession saved from sin, is more to be valued in the sight of the Holy Angels and Saints of Heaven and God Himself, than ninety-nine who need, or think that they need, no repentance.

I have endeavoured now, my Lord, to explain to you in some degree, those points of your objection to the Church which reflect upon her discipline and doctrine; but there is one point which stands the first and foremost on your list, which I have as yet left untouched. I have reserved it to the last, because I know that in your own opinion it is the most important. I am not much afraid that you care about the infallibility of the Church, or her power of the keys, or the muttering of the liturgy; I should rather be afraid that these are put forth, because you believed they would prove popular objections for the mob. I really believe that the one, and the only one, real objection and alarm in your Lordship's mind is this: *The Queen's Supremacy*. I think, from what I have observed in the course of Dr. Hampden's appointment to the see of Hereford, and Mr. Gorham's appointment to the living of Bramford Speke, that your opinion concerning the Royal Prerogative in the matters of the Church is very high indeed; that you arrogate for the crown something which approaches the actual Papal powers, against which, in the Pope himself, you so vigorously protest. And then we must remember that the Royal Prerogative *now* is nothing more than the Prime Minister's prerogative; and the Prime Minister's prerogative is the people's prerogative. Hence the strength of the cry which now rises up against any party in the Church which either denies or limits it. It is easy to see why statesmen delight to honour the Queen's Supremacy. It is easy to see why Parliaments, why meetings, why parish vestries, why all assemblies of men of whatever creed, or whatever kind, or for whatever purpose banded together, decry what is now called "The Papal Aggression".

Men have not yet learned to separate the spiritual

power of the Church from the temporal. They imagine that when the Pope is mentioned as a foreign prince or potentate, and that when he claims jurisdiction *in* England, that he claims jurisdiction over *all* England. Every one who knows History, knows full well that the Rock upon which the Church is founded is not of this world—"My kingdom," said our Blessed Lord, "is not of this world"—that the throne of S. Peter the fisherman does not claim jurisdiction over the souls of men, because it accidentally happens to be also a *temporal* throne, but only because of the spiritual power committed by our Lord:—"Upon this Rock I will build My Church."

It suits your Lordship, because it is a popular outcry, to set the people on a false scent about "No Popery", in order to strengthen your own secret schemes within, of strengthening the Royal power in the things of the Church. All the bishoprics, deaneries, canonries, a great number of livings, and offices and places in and about the Church, are yours. You are contending, therefore, for the continuance of your own advantage, when you contend for the continuance (in your own sense of it) of the Queen's Supremacy. You are contending for the power of general liberty of opinion,—Latitudinarianism, Freethinking, Scepticism, and the like. When you contend for a Royal Headship over the Church, you are contending for your own power to appoint a Dr. Hampden to all the sees of England; and a Mr. Gorham to all the parishes of England, that by so doing you may, by the weakness of the clergy, and their division, and their jealousies of each other, ride through the storm yourself triumphant. I leave it for your consideration, whether you really have any love for the truth, and any desire to increase the strength of Christ's Church, as such, when you speak of the Royal Supremacy,—or whether it is only from a sort of statesman's etiquette, that power should always be in his hands.

I would remind you, my Lord, of what happened at the Hampton Court Conference, in the reign of James I :

“The king reminded Dr. Reynolds that he had several times argued for his supremacy, which his majesty liked well, and then put this question to him, whether he knew any persons at the conference or elsewhere, who approving the present ecclesiastical government, disliked the regale? Dr. Reynolds answered, ‘No.’ ‘Why, then’, says the king, ‘I will tell you a story. When the Reformation in England was overturned by Queen Mary, we found the effect of it in Scotland, for then Knox, in a letter to the queen-regent (a virtuous and moderate lady) told her she was supreme head of the Church, and charged her, as she would answer it before God’s tribunal, to take care of Christ’s evangel, and of suppressing the popish prelates who withstood the same. But how long, think you’, continues the king, ‘did he hold this opinion? Why, till by her authority the popish bishops were disabled, till himself and his adherents were settled and grown strong enough to work by themselves; for when they found themselves in the seat, and big enough to manage the contest, they deserted from her supremacy, undertook the business without law, and pretending new degrees of illumination, reformed further at discretion. How they used the poor lady my mother is well known, and lies uneasy on my memory. This princess only desired a private chapel for herself and a few of her family, to serve God in the way of her education; but her supremacy, it seems, was not considerable enough to procure this liberty. And how they treated me in my minority, you all know.’ Then, putting his hand to his hat, ‘My lords the bishops,’ says his majesty, ‘I may thank you that these men plead thus strongly for my supremacy; they think they cannot make their party good against you, but by appealing to the regale, as if you, or some of your friends, were disaffected to it. But if once you are *out*, and they *in* place, I know what would become of my supremacy; for, no bishop, no king! as I said before.’”*

Suffer me to remind you, my Lord, that in the English Church as by law established, there are two distinct component parts. There is not only a Royal power as over civil matters attaching to the Church by accident, but there is the sacerdotal power inherent in the Church by essence. That is accidental, without the existence of which the Church would still exist; namely, the Royal Supremacy. That is essential, without the existence of which the Church would be no Church at all,—namely, the sacerdotal power. That which is essential, we must take to be the part of the Church which is alone worth preservation; that which is accidental, notwithstanding the many privileges attaching to the accident, we must, in the coming contest, cheer-

* Collier, book viii, part ii, 682.

fully abandon. Hitherto we have been brought up in the idea, that there is between the two parts an inseparable connection. Church and State has been a cry of the eighteenth and first half of the nineteenth century, to which no one, whatever he thought secretly, dared to raise a voice of objection openly. But this mysterious charm is fast dissolving now. Whether the Church is still to be a Parliamentary Church, is a question that is now-a-days continually agitated and discussed. Whether the "Establishment", as a mere legal affair, is to take the lead and supersede the Church as Christ's Spouse, is now a question. The Establishment, as such, is a statesman's tool. It is his creature, his instrument, his food; but the Church, *as such*, is of a very different complexion. She is his opponent, his mistress, his superior and ruler. She is not under him as coming from Cæsar, but above him as coming from GOD. You endeavour, my Lord, to confound two palpably distinct things. The Royal Supremacy every loyal Englishman would cheerfully acknowledge, provided it be limited to the "Establishment", and that government of the Church which is permissible by the law of Christ; but when it is claimed over the CHURCH, either in doctrine or discipline, we retire to our citadel and defy it. "My kingdom is not of this world". The Royal Supremacy in civil matters, as well as in ecclesiastical matters, as long as they are merely ecclesiastical and not spiritual; also in all temporal matters, causes and trials, arising out of them, we cheerfully acknowledge: but the Royal Supremacy in the doctrines of our Blessed Lord, in the discipline of the Church within, in the regulation of her pastors, in the enunciation of her doctrines, we utterly and explicitly deny. This matter has been well considered, and the exact shape and form of words by which I would embrace the idea of the Royal Supremacy, is embodied in the following propositions, to which I beg your Lordship's attention; in order that, if I am right, my flock may know, as far as I am myself concerned, what is meant by denying the Royal Supremacy and what is not meant:—

1. I have hitherto acknowledged, and do now acknowledge, the Supremacy of the Crown in ecclesiastical matters to be a supreme civil power over all persons and causes in temporal things, and over the temporal accidents of spiritual things.

2. I do not, and in conscience cannot, acknowledge in the Crown the power recently exercised to hear and judge in appeal the internal state or merits of spiritual questions touching doctrine or discipline, the custody of which is committed to the Church alone by the law of Christ.

3. I therefore, for the relief of my own conscience, hereby publicly declare that I acknowledge the Royal Supremacy in the sense above stated, and in no other.

These propositions, I believe, have been subscribed by about one thousand eight hundred clergy. It is our only way of extricating ourselves from the difficulty of denying our blessed Lord and Master, and His kingdom, which "is not of this world"; our only way of getting rid of the Erastian sin of considering the Church as a mere creature of the state, and surrendering the things of GOD to the things of Cæsar, contrary to our blessed Lord's own precept. I would remind you, my Lord, as a statesman, and first minister of her Majesty's Government, of what Thorndike says (and with him many divines agree); that, in case of so terrible a necessity, our duty as churchmen is plain; and that there are many now ready to abide by it, should you continue, as you have done, to press forward your claim to unlimited power over the Church. This is what Thorndike says:—

"For seeing there is, by this determination, no manner of coercive power in the Church, but all in the state (for excommunication constrains but upon supposition that a man resolves to be a Christian), there remains but one head in the civil society of every state, so absolute over the persons that make the Church, that the independent power thereof in Church matters will enable it to do nothing against, but suffer all things from the sovereign. And yet so absolute, and depending on God alone in Church matters, that if a sovereign professing Christianity should not only forbid the profession of that faith, or the exercise of those ordinances which God hath required to be served with; but even the exercise of that ecclesiastical power, which

shall be necessary to preserve the unity of the Church, it must needs be necessary for those that are trusted with the power of the Church, not only to disobey the commands of the sovereign, but to use that power which their quality in the society of the Church gives them to provide for the subsistence thereof without the assistance of secular powers." Thorndike, *Right of the Church in a Christian State*, p. 189.*

It would be well indeed, my Lord, that your Lordship, and those who agree with you in your theory of an Act of Parliament Church, should consider the probable effects of straining too far your idea of governing her by a power external to herself. It would be well that you do so, before it be too late. Remember that we stand in the *via media* between two great opponents, on either side, who distinctly and utterly repudiate your theory,—I mean the great body of Protestant Dissenters on the one side, and the great and increasing body of the Roman Catholic Church on the other: that it has happened of late, and must happen more and more frequently, as time goes on, that disaffected members of the English Church will be continually thrown off her body, into one or other of these inimical portions of the religious world surrounding her: as for instance, Mr. Baptist Noel to the side of Dissent, and many of the most learned and most holy of our clergy (too many for me now to name) to the side of Rome. Remember that by this we are gradually attenuated, weakened, and emptied out, and shall soon be not much more than dry bones. If this be your object, well indeed you are working towards it; if not, then let me supplicate you; my voice, indeed, is but poor, but yet it is a voice; let me supplicate you to pause before you bring us to this dread alternative, either secession from the communion of the Church of England, or resistance to the temporal power for conscience sake. The miseries consequent on such an alternative.—the miseries of the poor, the hearts of thousands broken, the hopes of thousands dispersed; scepticism, doubts, misgivings of all truth, infidelity,—these, my Lord, must be the inevitable results.

And let me honestly tell you, my Lord, that to resist

* London: Cleaver, 1841.

the Church; I mean the Church as really such—God's ordinance—to resist the Church, I do not say it in your parliamentary sense, but the Church of the living Saviour of the world; His bride, His spouse; to resist her, is a vain thing: "Whosoever shall fall on this stone shall be broken, but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder". If you drive the Church out of England, the Church will rise up, my Lord, elsewhere. If you destroy her as a component part of the institutions of this country, you will have her riding over your head triumphant, in that foreign prince, whom then you will have good reason, according to your own principles, to dread. The Rock of Ages does not depend upon the crown of any temporal prince, nor rest for its security on Acts of Parliament. Ask the Dissenters what they think of this doctrine? Ask Dr. Cumming. Would *he* submit his Presbyterian doctrines to be judged by the civil and temporal lawyers of Her Majesty's Privy Council? He never has done so, and he never will. Ask the Wesleyans, the Independents, the Baptists, would *they* permit their doctrines to be overhauled in your courts of common or ecclesiastical law? Of course they would not. Well then, where is the justice of talking about civil and religious liberty, if the State is brought in to rule matters which do not belong, never have belonged, and never *can* belong to it? The Church's Infallibility goes along with the Church's Supremacy. They are one and the same. They are above all earthly canons, out of sight, and beyond the reach of all the Acts of Parliament that England ever had; beyond all the sovereigns that ever reigned throughout the world; beyond, in short, every power and every will, every strength and every dominion, save that only which is of the King of kings and Lord of lords.

What is the general character of the Church of England, its general tone, the beating of its pulse, the circulation of its blood? Statesmen as such know very well. And how to rule her and make her subject either to the blandishments of worldly delights or the threats

of worldly violence, they know very well. Its Erastian spirit—its barren, and generally speaking, lukewarm care for souls when contrasted with the Roman Church—we feel humbled in acknowledging. What a bitter and biting sarcasm that is, my Lord, of the new Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, when he speaks of conceding the parks and the palaces of Westminster to *us*, retaining the lanes and streets of the poor for *his* archbishopric. In parallel with this, I would ask you to read what Dr. Arnold says. He speaks of the Church of England as never recovering the “Aristocratic and regal selfishness of its birth”. I quote Dr. Arnold, let me remind you, because he is one of your own. He says—

“It seems then, that in the improved state of society, the influence of the Catholic clergy is used for purposes of general charity, and not for their own advantage; and who would not wish that our clergy dared to exercise something of the same influence over our higher classes, and could prevent that most unchristian spirit of family selfishness and pride, by which too many wills of our rich men are wholly dictated? But our Church bears, and has ever borne the marks of her birth; the child of regal and aristocratical selfishness and unprincipled tyranny, she has never dared to speak boldly to the great, but has contented herself with lecturing the poor. ‘I will speak of thy testimonies even before kings, and will not be ashamed’, is a text which the Anglican Church, as a national institution, never seems to have caught the spirit of. Folly, and worse than folly is it, to think that preaching what are called orthodox doctrines before the great is really preaching to them the Gospel. Unless the particular conclusions which they should derive from those doctrines be impressed upon them; unless they are warned against the particular sins to which they are tempted by their station in society, and urged to the particular duties which their political and social state requires of them, the Gospel will be heard without offence, and, *therefore*, one may almost say, without benefit. Of course I do not mean offence at the manner in which it is preached; nor offence, indeed, at all, in the common sense of the word; but a feeling of soreness that they are touched by what they hear, a feeling which makes the conscience uneasy, because it cannot conceal from itself that its own practice is faulty.”—*Arnold's Life and Correspondence*, vol. ii, p. 382.

Yes, alas! it is no new thing thus to speak. We are too fond of praising our own works, and exalting our own glory. It is good to be thus humbled, and by one of the most candid and close observing men of his age.

If such words had been uttered by me or by any of

the clergy whom your Lordship calls "insidious", we should soon have been overwhelmed with accusations of disloyalty and disaffection, but coming as they do from your own friend, what will you say? Let me tell you, thoughtful men begin to feel this truth more closely than you imagine.

But now to bring this letter to a conclusion. I would say to you, my Lord, in the language of Hosius to the Emperor Constantine—

"Stay, I beseech you. Remember that you are a mortal man. Fear the day of judgment. Keep your hands clean against it. Meddle not with Church matters. Far from advising us about them, rather seek instruction from us. God has put dominion into your hands. To us he has entrusted the management of the Church, and as a traitor to you is a rebel to the God Who ordained you, so be afraid on your part, lest, usurping ecclesiastical power, you become guilty of a great sin. It is written, 'Render unto Cæsar, Cæsar's, and what is God's to God'. *We* may not bear rule upon earth, *you*, O emperor, may not bear rule in the things of worship. I write this from a care for your soul."—*Ath. Hist. Arian. ad Mon.* 44.

I pray God, my Lord, even yet daily more and more will I pray, that you may be spared from being the instrument, under God's hand, for the destruction of the Church of England. It is a fearful thought for a man to dwell upon, that possibly he may be the appointed channel in the councils of God for some sweeping calamity about to descend upon this great nation. I presume you would really think that the loss of her Church *would* be a sweeping calamity. Yet the loss of her Church is by no means, at the present moment, in her peculiar position, an impossible thing. May I, a very humble individual, entreat you to pause, to stay your hand, to arrest the downward course of her fall, before it be too late. For myself, and those around me here, while we will give ourselves only the more sedulously to prayer and sacraments, and the good works of the poor, we will not give way one single inch in the duties we owe to the Church. The spirit of Pilate may be in the rulers—the spirit of Judas in the brethren—the spirit of Gallio in the nobles—but yet let us hope that there may be the spirit of Peter and Paul in the priests and bishops of the fold. For our-

selves, the greater the fierceness of the people's madness, so much the greater our patience; the more violent their outcries of wrath, the more earnest and the longer our prayers. May it be said of us as it was of S. Gregory Nazianzen—

“The rage and clamour was great against him, but he comforted himself at that instant to remember, that though they had the stronger party, yet he and his had the better cause; they had the churches, he had God; they had the people to back them, he had angels to guard him; they had boldness and confidence, he had the Faith on his side; they could threaten, while he would pray; they beat him, and he endured it; they had wealth and treasure, he the true Catholic doctrine.”—*Cave's Lives of the Fathers*, fol. p. 525.

I have the honour to be, my Lord,

Your Lordship's humble servant and

Parish Priest,

WM. J. E. BENNETT.

POSTSCRIPT.

For fear of misunderstanding, I desire to add to the observations made at page 19, to the following effect.

I have stated that the church, in its tone, building, ornaments, and all other points, is the same now as it was at the day of consecration, when it was openly sanctioned by the Bishop. I would say that the ceremonial used at the holy Communion is not the same. On the day of consecration the Bishop himself celebrated the holy Communion, and every thing was done according to his own will and custom, but subsequently

we adopted that form of celebration which was in use at Margaret Chapel (now All Saints), and also used at Christ Church, S. Pancras, and at S. Andrew's, Wells Street. This form of celebration was adopted as understood to be known to and permitted by the Bishop. The lights, also, burning at the time of the holy Communion, as already mentioned, were added on the ground of their being sanctioned by the Church, for which see Dr. Hook's *Church Dictionary*, under the word "Altar Lights", and also as being used at Margaret Chapel.

I have received, in a letter from a friend on whose information I can rely, the following remarkable statement, bearing on the use of the Cross and Lights upon the Altar.

"In the German Liturgy, published at Berlin in 1829, by authority of the late King of Prussia, for the use of the Evangelic Church throughout his dominions, it is required by the rubric to have 'two burning lights, with a crucifix,' on the 'altar' at the time of the celebration of the Sacrament. This liturgy received the sanction of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, at the institution of the Jerusalem bishopric, and was authorised by him for the use of the Protestant congregations who voluntarily submit to that episcopate. The celebrant is directed therein to stand and turn towards the midst of the altar, with his back to the people, at consecration, prayers, and hymns. The service itself commences with the words, 'In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' The sign of the cross is made by the celebrant at the absolution, consecration, and benediction in this liturgy. The Archbishop of Canterbury acted under Parliament as the authorized representative of the English Church."

I would beg to draw your Lordship's attention to the following opinion of Dr. Cumming, by which you will be astonished to see how strong his advocacy appears for the chant and choral service, which your Lordship, I presume, designates by the expression "muttering the Liturgy".

"I do so long to see the wretched rants that are but too popular

banished from our churches, in order that these grave and noble compositions may occupy their place; and one object of this lecture is, to lead you, if possible, to abjure and eject many of those tunes which have neither merit nor beauty, and popularize those noble compositions, the anthems, chants, and tunes of the ancient masters . . . The chant is the most purely Protestant music. The common tune and the metrical hymn, are God's Words shaped and adapted to man's music; but the chant is God's Word retained as the Spirit gave it, and man's music following and unfolding it. . . . The words of the composition of Farrant, which I will ask the choir to illustrate, are, 'Lord, for Thy tender mercies' sake, lay not our sins to our charge, but forgive us what is past, and give us grace to amend our sinful lives, to decline from sin, and to incline to virtue; that we may walk with a perfect heart before Thee, now and evermore.' In the reign of Elizabeth flourished Tallis . . . the author of a single chant . . . containing in the melody not above three or four notes, and yet in its harmony extremely expressive, and truly fitted for Christian worship: 'Blessed be the Lord God of Israel,' etc. I wish you to notice how very simple that music is; and yet, if ministers of the Gospel, and others who have influence in this matter, will introduce that style of music into their congregations, they will find it the most popular of all. In the sixteenth century flourished Palestrina, the Homer of music, whose powers, however, were given to the Church of Rome. In the seventeenth century flourished Orlando Gibbons, the author of a celebrated Sanctus. . . . In the beginning of the eighteenth century flourished John Blow. His beautiful single chant in the minor key I am never weary of listening to. Among the English composers, the most illustrious is Purcell, and one regrets that his music is not more known, or rather more used, than it is. Time would fail me, to speak of Pergolesi, Jomelli, and others: in later times, Handel's name is a household word. . . . Why should there be no congregation able to sing at Christmas, 'Unto us a Child is born,' etc.? One regrets that the compositions of such masters as Haydn and Mozart are inseparable from the superstitions of the Church of Rome. . . . I do lament that Rome has secured so rich music for Passion [Holy] Week. I know nothing grander than the *Miserere* that noble, monotonous burden of sound, rising and swelling as if the heavy moan of a world's calamity. . . . All this is grand: it has been monopolized by the Papacy,

because Protestantism has disregarded it. . . . These noble compositions have become so identified with Romanism, that we think them essentially Romish.

“Some of Luther’s tunes are from the old Latin chants, and others were composed by himself. Most of the singing in the Mass, he said, is very fine and glorious, breathing nothing but thankfulness and praise; such as ‘Gloria in Excelsis, Alleluia, Benedictus [Sanctus] Agnus Dei’.

“It is essential to effective general singing in a congregation that there be a powerful concentrated choir.” (*Music in its Relation to Religion*. A Lecture by the Rev. John Cumming, D.D., Minister to the National Scotch Church, Crown Court. Delivered in Exeter Hall, Jan. 29, 1850. Sir E. N. Buxton, Bart., M.P., in the chair London, Nisbet.

A SERMON,

ALLUDED TO IN THE PRECEDING LETTER, PREACHED AT
S. PAUL'S, KNIGHTSBRIDGE, ON SUNDAY MORNING
AND EVENING, NOVEMBER 17, 1850.

S. LUKE, xxi, 17, 18, 19.

“And ye shall be hated of all men for My name’s sake. But there shall not an hair of your head perish; in your patience possess ye your souls.”

WHAT more can we have than this? A prophecy of suffering,—“Hated of all men”. And yet a prophecy of safety,—“Not a hair of your head shall perish”. And the means whereby we shall attain our safety,—“In your patience possess ye your souls”.

Suffering! “Hated of all men”! It is, brethren, the token of a Christian. How often have we spoken from this place, in *theory*, of persecution and the cross. How often, when surrounded here by the fears of the great and the glad agreement of an approving multitude, and when all without was smooth and prosperous, and all within was comfort and joy,—how often have we spoken about self-sacrifice and self-denial; of the passion of our Lord, as the passion ready for ourselves; of the crucifixion of His precious body on Calvary, as the type of ours; and His denial of the world, as our denial of friends and once beloved ones; and how all was to the Christian, if rightly received, the token of his reality and his earnestness, the harbinger of his crown. O, brethren, it was very easy then to talk thus, when we did not know of its real coming, and only imagined it and painted it, as it were, in a picture, and looked at it from a distance; and, as I said, it was a *theory* to us. For how could it be otherwise than than a kind of

dream; when speaking here there came a thousand listeners, with titles of the world's greatness round about them, and when the chief ones of the earth would come and kneel down among us, and worship, and give GOD thanks? And then we had only to say, will you do this for us, for the Church, for our schools, for our poor? and all did it gladly; and very seldom did there come across us a stray voice of discontent or murmur, but that it was hushed and put aside; and very seldom did there float along the air of our holy worship any accidental breath of displeasure, but that it was quickly soothed and lulled into quiet by the confidence of our hope, and the stedfastness of our faith.

How very easy *then*, to talk of being "*hated of all men*"!

But GOD has been very gracious to us; for where there was a possibility of danger from an over-confidence in man, or a temptation to vain-glory in the success of human efforts, if viewed irrespectively of GOD, there it has pleased Him now to interfere. He has gone to the higher grounds of blessing instead of the lower. He has given us tears, and sorrow, and mis-giving, instead of the fulness of joy which used to dwell among us. He has given us the hatred of men instead of their praise, their curse instead of their blessing. He has taken away the danger of any mere theory of suffering, by putting it personally before us. We are beginning at last to know, in GOD's mercy, the reality of "*suffering for His name's sake*", of being hated, and reviled, and separated, and cast out. Our cross is taken up. Let us pray that we may bear it bravely.

Can you conceive anything, brethren, that could possibly give to those, who love the Lord Jesus Christ, and believe what He promises, a greater, or a purer source of joy, than such a text as this; and then to see the fair and worldly friends who used to flock here, *now*, because the wind has changed in the current of its flow, and the tide begins to ebb, and the clouds look dark, and there is a lurid spot of something like a storm brooding on the horizon, to see these great ones

(specially one) joining the common multitude in their cry; that multitude, who would, as we know last Sunday they did, enter the house of GOD, and drown the adoring voices of pure and holy worshippers with cries of blasphemy, and threaten destruction to all that belonged to the sanctuary with axes and hammers; that multitude, who with *one* voice would enter the chief city of England, and elevate with approbation a Jew into its seat of legislation, and with *another* voice would desecrate the house of a Christian's GOD, with cries of "Down with it, down with it, even to the ground."

I say to you then, brethren, now the time has come; the real time; it is no longer a dream now; a theory now. "Ye shall be hated of all men for My name's sake." Does it not seem a very glad fulfilling of the earnestness of our faith; for see how our blessed Lord speaks of such things: "Rejoice and be exceeding glad when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely." "Rejoice, and *leap* for joy, when men shall hate you, and separate you, and cast out your name as evil." "*Blessed* are they that mourn, that are poor in spirit, that are persecuted for righteousness' sake." And the Apostles readily follow our blessed Lord in this teaching: and for what reason? Our *reward*, our glory, our crown. Not here, but in His glory: "If we suffer we shall also reign with Him." "Yea, and all that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution." It seems inseparable. It seems an almost necessary condition of a true faith. "If when ye do well, and suffer for it, ye take it patiently, this is acceptable with GOD; for even hereunto were ye called." It was for this very purpose that we were made Christians.

Then I say, brethren, to you that remain here true, while the worldly fly; that pause in a quiet assurance of your rectitude of purpose, while the timid are scared at they know not what, and the lukewarm give way, and the faithless wander, and heedless swell the thronging multitude in their sneers and their blasphemy. To you, brethren, it surely is a blessed privilege to know,

that, what we talked of before in theory, now is a glad and living thing; that you are far nearer Christ than you ever were before; that you know something now of "the Man of sorrows and acquainted with grief"; that you are joined in His stripes, drink of the blood of His wounds, suffer in His passion, are crucified in His death: and so, do really see before you now some little glimpse of the crown, with which, if you persevere, He will eventually greet you in the kingdom of His glory.

But it is promised of GOD that in the midst of this suffering, there shall yet be safety—"Not a hair of your head shall perish". It was said to them who were about to pass through the fearful troubles of the siege of Jerusalem. It was a prophecy that they should as Christians escape out of the danger which surrounded them; and while the Jews should be utterly destroyed by the victorious armies of the Roman empire, they should escape, and be unharmed. And what is it to us? It is a typical promise of the same security. The world may be against us,—the armies of the world may be in array for our destruction. There is no escape from them save in GOD, but in GOD there is,—“Not a hair of your head shall perish”.

Jacob, though a great favourite (so to speak) with GOD,—chosen by Him specially above his elder brother Esau, and made the channel of His grace for the salvation of the world,—yet was a man continually beset by trouble, vexation, fear, and annoyance. Immediately after the promise of GOD, that his seed should be as the dust of the earth, and in him should the families of the earth be blessed, there was a vision specially sent, manifesting to him GOD's favour and love; yet, with all this—with all this clear demonstration of the power of GOD on his side, yet he seemed to be deficient in confidence: he spoke hesitatingly, without assurance—"If GOD be with me, and will keep me in the way that I go, and will give me bread to eat, and raiment to put on (*if*—it was hypothetical),—then shall the Lord be my GOD". And when, subsequently, Esau rose up against him, and he fled,—

and then, by GOD'S command, was about to return to his native country,—yet he was in trouble: “ Deliver me, I pray Thee, from the hand of my brother.” It was a cry of anguish and doubt. And then once more,—when Joseph was lost, he put sackcloth upon his loins, and all his sons and all his daughters rose up to comfort him, “ but he *refused* to be comforted.” And then again, when it was proposed to take Benjamin,—“ Me have ye bereaved of my children”, he said, as though he could no longer bear it,—“ Joseph is not, and Simeon is not, and ye will take Benjamin away: all these things are against me.”

Such, brethren, is the picture of a troubled man,—troubled by worldly things, troubled by losses, and afflictions in temporal prosperity. One thing comes after another, blow upon blow,—to-day one, to-morrow another;—to-day misinterpretation of words, to-morrow desertion of friends,—the next day defamation of things beloved,—then hatred, then contempt, then poverty; until the mind is weakened, dispirited, cast down, cannot lift itself up,—and cries out in its utter prostration, and abandonment, to whatsoever may happen—“ All these things are *against* me.”

Now take an opposite of Jacob, who is in the Law, —namely *S. Paul*, who is in the Gospel. At first there is every outward demonstration of prosperity. A sincere and successful persecutor of a rising sect, as he called them, opposed to his own opinions,—held of great esteem among his own,—of the strictest and most esteemed among his countrymen for religion and for learning; and so he had all that the world could give him. Then he changes, and immediately, with opposition to the world comes the *persecution* of the world. They who before loved him, now hated him. They who before sided with him, now are against him. Then what followed. Poverty and suffering were his daily companions while he preached Christ crucified, whom before he denied. Instead of ease, there came labour and toil; instead of honour, reproach; instead of the well-speaking of the world, its contumely; instead of riches

and affluence, need, want, and afflictions; instead of the great ones of the earth, the chief rulers and the high priest employing him in honourable embassies, their violent and searching persecution. And these not once, or for a short time, or with any hope of cessation, but daily, continuous, and not ending but with death. You know his own description of himself, in 2 Corinthians,—“ In labours more abundant, in stripes above measure, in prisons more frequent, in deaths oft; of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one, thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned; thrice I suffered shipwreck, and night and day have I been in the deep, in journeyings often, in perils of water, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness, and painfulness, and watchings often; in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness.”

Well, did all this daunt him? Did he give way? Did he hold up his hands in despair, and say as Jacob said, “All these things are against me.” No, but hear what he said: “If I must needs glory, I will glory in the things which concern mine infirmities.” And why? Because he went about with this assurance, “*Not a hair of your head shall perish.*” It was the voice of the Living GOD that whispered within his whole spirit and character of faith. “*It is I, be not afraid*”. It was the voice that gave comfort to the three children in the fiery furnace, and Daniel in the lions’ den. It was the voice that came to the blessed Jesus in His agony of Gethsemane; the voice of GOD, by holy angels ministering, comforting, cheering. It was that voice which says: “When summer friends are gone and fled”, still thou art not alone. When the blaze of persecution gleams around, still thou art not alone. When tyrants do their work, and the people rage; when there is a fancied triumph of the wicked, and the spoiler exults in the overthrow of the righteous, there is yet ONE left, the single friend; ONE single voice, which says, *I am with thee.* This is a spell which none can know

but the sorrowing for righteousness' sake; a charm, which, in the midst of the deepest woe, still whispers, "Be not afraid; cling to the Rock; bear all things, endure all things, hope all things". And so the Apostle. It was not a grief to him to suffer the hatred of men; it was not a pain. No; his sufferings became a pleasure. He rejoiced in them. "Therefore", he says: "I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ's sake; for when I am weak then am I strong".

And shall it not be so with us, brethren. Shall we join with Jacob in his worldly despair, or with Paul in his spiritual joy? Shall we say: "All these things are against me", and give all up; forsake our principles, and deny our faith to please the multitude; or shall we say: "I will glory in my infirmities, for of Thee do they come, O GOD". How many things there are in us, types of our spiritual suffering! Our very baptism is a type and sacramental figure of suffering. Shall we who are baptised *not* suffer? The blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist is a type and sacramental figure of suffering. A broken body, a poured-out cup; types of agony, passion, woe, and death. Are we to go thither for our chiefest stay, and then refuse to bear with Him, Whom there we commemorate; the breaking of our hopes and joys, the pouring out of our souls in sorrow to Him. "Can ye be baptized", saith He Himself, "with the baptism that I am baptized with, and are ye able to drink of the cup that I drink of?" *We are able*. We will strive to do so, O GOD. Our toil may be thankless; our labour, lost; our intentions misinterpreted, and our hopes dispersed. We may be hated of the world; not understood, forsaken, despised; but in Thy baptism, O SON OF GOD, we will take cheerfully our part, and of Thy cup we will cheerfully drink. "It is the Lord, Let Him do what seemeth Him good". "If GOD be for us, who can be against us". "*Not a hair of our head shall perish*".

And now let me speak of the MEANS. How shall we do all this? Our blessed Lord tells us: "In your

patience possess ye your souls". And the word patience here does not mean, in its common sense, a mere suffering, but it means an *abiding* (*υπομονη*), a WAITING; it means, be not in a hurry; "Tarry the Lord's leisure"; wait, and see what the Lord will bring to pass.

Times of excitement are sure to throw up the dregs and refuse of society to the surface. All whose passions are violent and not under control, all who are destitute of the power of reflection and thought, all who are fond of becoming important, all who have a zeal for religion without knowledge, all who are narrow-minded and bigoted in their ideas, all who have a political turn to serve,—these, and such others, are sure to put themselves forth at such times, take advantage of current events, and stimulate the multitude on one side, or are stimulated themselves on the other, to acts of outrage and persecution. This has been the case among us here, and is now, as you well know. Here is our unhappy Church, torn and rent and bruised in every member of her body; full of division, sectarianism, heresy. Here is one party contending against another. Here are the very rulers of the Church themselves poisoned, incapacitated, feeble, without power of action. Here are the rulers of the State taking counsel against the Lord and His anointed; and the Heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing. The public mind has taken in one absorbing idea, which has been skilfully infused into it by politicians and statesmen, who desire to turn the crisis to their own account. All the *world*, forgetful of aught but its own will, runs headlong down the precipice, like the swine possessed with the evil spirit, not knowing where they are going, what they are saying, or what will be the issue of their madness and their folly. *The many* are but tools and puppets of a wise craftsman, who stands above and leads them on. Then, of course, happens what we have seen in our days. The object is to crush that portion of the Church of England which is true to its spirit as a Church, and to elevate that portion of it which is attached to the Erastian policy of the Government. The Establishment is the

tool of statesmen, and used as such; the Church is thought to be their enemy, and treated as such. The Establishment therefore is strengthened by feeding it with unorthodox Bishops and heretical priests, and the laws of the land are strained and perverted for the maintenance of mere State purposes. Then, every one who dares to run in opposition to this spirit; everyone who speaks of the Church as independent of the State, as the Body of our blessed Lord, and only of Him depending, and by Him to be sustained and fed; every one who on this principle goes forward to work for the Church, as for Christ, preaches unity and the kingdom of the Gospel, as opposed to the kingdom of the world, restores Catholic usages, spends his time and his love in beautifying the Lord's sanctuary, is full of deep and strict attention to all ancient laws of discipline; heeds not the power of the great, but rebukes vice even in the highest; despises the favour of courts and kings, and bids the great ones of the earth kneel down, and bow, and humble themselves before the great GOD and King of all; who tells the people, without fear and without compromise, that they must "hear the Church" if they will be saved, receive the blessings of the sacraments, and worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness:— every one, be he priest or layman, who does this, is now the subject of persecution and malignity; he is pointed out as the dangerous enemy of his country and his Church; and the infuriated mob are fed up and led on in their passions, for the purpose of destroying this enemy.*

* These allusions will be easily understood by most persons who have studied the history of the Church for the last ten years. The appointment of Dr. Hampden to the see of Hereford; in vain the remonstrance made by a certain number of the bishops; in vain the opposition by Dr. Merewether the dean of the cathedral in his election; in vain its opposition by the Church at his confirmation. Then the appointment of Mr. Gorham to the living of Bramford Speke; his rejection by the Bishop of Exeter on points of manifest heresy; the trial in the court of Arches, where the Bishop's judgment was confirmed; his appeal to the Privy Council; the remarkable trial which there took place; the judgment of the Court of Arches reversed; the Archbishop

Of course it is very easy, brethren, for *us* to see through all this. But it is not easy for the multitude, for they know not what they do. They are only led hither and thither, by the crafty and the skilful, who use them for their own purposes. But being as we are, suffering as I have described, what are we to do? We are to WAIT. It is plain, very plain, that GOD'S hand is upon the Church of England just now, whether for good or evil we cannot tell; we must *wait* and see. We must not act precipitately. We must not be indignant, or wrathful, or revengeful, or retort in a bad spirit, but we must be calm, dignified, patient. We must endure and wait. If feelings get excited on our part, if passions boil up, if on *our* side we recriminate, or become impetuous and hasty, then our course is run—the last days of the Church of England as a Church are at hand. As a State Establishment she may linger on, but she will, in that case, become more and more Erastian every year, and so lose the spirit and life of her Blessed Head, both in doctrine and in practice, until by degrees

of Canterbury forcing the priest condemned of unsound doctrine in his own court, *against* his own court, into the diocese of another bishop, on the authority of the State. Then a little further on, the Roman Church sending bishops, and the people rising up, not in tempered or calm reasoning concerning the measure, but urging political cries of "No Popery". Then, upon this, a letter from the prime minister, under cover of the Bishop's Charge, inflaming the mob. Then our own unfortunate case, on beholding our beautiful house desecrated by the inroads of profane men, who came with hootings and yells, and fierce threats that they would destroy all before them. This, indeed, is a series of events, all pressing on each other, and leading on to some great catastrophe, too manifest, too significant of some essential inherent weakness in the Church of England *as a Church*. And now no one speaks of our wrongs, no one speaks of the heresy which is still among us, no one remembers the instances above described, although not so far away; but all seem hanging on to one exciting topic—*No Popery*.—Why was it that we had not this activity in the case of Dr. Hampden or in the case of Mr. Gorham? because men are not sensible of any danger. Why not sensible of any danger? because the great bulk of the people are very little taught in the doctrines of the Church, I mean the great doctrine which applies to that subject—Sacramental grace. But in the case of the Bishop of Rome, it is *political*. The political objection is manifest. The religious objection is not heeded.

she will die completely out. "In your patience possess ye your souls". Great things are at hand, wait and see what they are. The shadows are too dark just at present for us to read what GOD says. We are too much excited and beside ourselves to judge calmly of what is our duty. The writing on the wall is as yet dim and confused. There will be more light anon, and then we may try and read it: greater certainty and precision in the writing as coming from GOD, greater confidence in the reading as appertaining to *us*. Soon there will come some mark or sign from GOD so clear that we shall not be able to misinterpret it, and have no excuse in turning aside so as visibly to give it no heed. Till that comes, "in your patience possess ye your souls". GOD may have much for us to do yet. There may be, no doubt there is much more suffering before us yet, much more division, and falling away, much more heresy, much greater insults to the Church, much greater oppression of the clergy, much more vituperation and slander of motives and principles, much more of that which David had in his heart, when he said "Why boastest thou, O tyrant, that thou canst do mischief?" What I desire to warn you against, and prepare you for, is this very point, that as yet, this is only the beginning of sorrows. Alas! what will they be in their fulness.

And now, brethren, let me add one single word further. One single word, as though it were the last that I should ever from this place address to you. Let your waiting be coupled with *hope*, let your waiting be coupled with *charity*. In faith, of course, all you do is done. In faith, it cannot be otherwise than presumed, that you would bear *with* me, or even *against* me, should it so be,—all that you do and think. You no doubt earnestly believe, that what you *do*, and what you *say*, in all that appertains to religion, comes of *faith*. You believe that it is necessary to salvation. You believe that without your doing it, you would be in danger of losing eternal life. No other than this deep principle could form the ground-work of your

worship, or the basis of your lives. Take away your faith, and your spiritual life is fundamentally and essentially extinct; for on the one hand you could neither find fault with what I say or do, with any degree of justification to your own conscience, or any idea of excuse before GOD; nor on the other hand could you agree with me in what I say or do, or join with me in carrying into operation what you have done, or what you may do, with any prospect of the eternal crown to be won by you in the salvation of your souls,—unless you possess deep down in your hearts as a principle of it all,—*faith* in the merits, and for the cause, of your blessed Redeemer and Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ. So that *faith*, I take it for granted, one way or other, is yours.

But I would speak of your waiting with *hope*. Yes, hope for the Church of England even yet, as the prophet Jeremiah beautifully says, “It is good that a man should both hope, and quietly wait, for the salvation of the Lord”. And S. Paul in like manner, “If we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it”. It is even hope against hope. Hope, even as it is called in war, a forlorn hope,—and *yet* a hope. I would ask you for *yourselevs*, brethren, I would ask you for *me*,—never cease to hope that GOD may even yet deliver Israel from all his troubles.

But above all, *charity*,—for without the third, what are the other two? S. Paul tells us they are nothing. We may do all things, suffer all things, labour in all things; endure, with the Apostles, imprisonment, and martyrdom, and give our body to be burned, and yet, without love it shall all be nothing. So let love prevail, even though this be the last word. Let love prevail: if anything should be done hostile to your feelings, if any act of aggression, if any slander, if any injustice, if any wrong,—remember, I beseech you, both for yourselves and for me, the golden rule of our blessed Lord, “Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you”. Consider

this; that in all great disputes of religious doctrine, when men's passions boil over, and they are hurried by impetuous and fervid minds into some one great extreme, —they are not almost (so to say) morally responsible; they are taken out of themselves; they do and say in the excitement of their zeal what they could not do and say in the calmer moments of deliberation. Consider their education, the natural tone and temper of their minds; their ignorance of your meaning, your ignorance of theirs. Consider this, too, that however right we may think ourselves, still we may *not* be right; we may be under a delusion ourselves. Or even this, we may be right for ourselves and in our case, and yet they may be right in GOD'S sight, in themselves, and in their case. We cannot tell. Charity would come in here, even though we might suffer, and "think no evil". Love would come in, and looking from HIS cross, even as He did Whose children we are, would say—"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do".

The first part of the book is devoted to a general history of the world, from the beginning of time to the present day. The author discusses the various civilizations that have flourished on the earth, and the progress of human knowledge and industry. He also touches upon the political and social changes that have shaped the modern world.


The second part of the book is a detailed account of the history of the United States, from its early days as a collection of colonies to its emergence as a powerful nation. The author describes the struggles of the American people for independence, and the development of the Constitution and the federal government. He also discusses the various wars and conflicts that have shaped the nation's history.

The third part of the book is a history of the world from the year 1800 to the present. The author discusses the various revolutions and wars that have shaped the modern world, and the progress of human knowledge and industry. He also touches upon the political and social changes that have shaped the modern world.

The fourth part of the book is a history of the world from the year 1800 to the present. The author discusses the various revolutions and wars that have shaped the modern world, and the progress of human knowledge and industry. He also touches upon the political and social changes that have shaped the modern world.

The fifth part of the book is a history of the world from the year 1800 to the present. The author discusses the various revolutions and wars that have shaped the modern world, and the progress of human knowledge and industry. He also touches upon the political and social changes that have shaped the modern world.

The sixth part of the book is a history of the world from the year 1800 to the present. The author discusses the various revolutions and wars that have shaped the modern world, and the progress of human knowledge and industry. He also touches upon the political and social changes that have shaped the modern world.



THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS
WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN
THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY
WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH
DAY AND TO \$1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY
OVERDUE.

ICLF (N)

JUN 17 1954

2 May '57 PT

29 Nov '57 H

REC'D LD

15 Nov '51 LU

MAY 2 1957

26 Nov '56 J

8 Jan '64 WW

REC'D LD
DEC 14 '63 - 2 PM
APR 14 1993

REC'D LD

NOV 14 1956

11 Apr '57 KL

REC'D LD

APR 8 1957

YB 30769

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C039648728

701004

BX5149
C5R4

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY

