



ml

Gr. affly
A. Carter

L I F E

OF

ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL TAIT

Archbishop of Canterbury



BY

RANDALL THOMAS DAVIDSON, D.D.

DEAN OF WINDSOR

AND

WILLIAM BENHAM, B.D.

HON. CANON OF CANTERBURY

IN TWO VOLS.

VOL. II.

LONDON

MACMILLAN AND CO.

AND NEW YORK

1891

CONTENTS

CHAPTER XIX.

1869.

The Disestablishment of the Irish Church	PAGE I
---	-------------------------

CHAPTER XX.

1869-1870.

The Archbishop's Diocesan Work—His Great Illness— Consecration of Bishop Temple—The Revisers' Com- munion	44
--	-----------

CHAPTER XXI.

1870-73.

Recovery from Illness—Journey Abroad—Voysey Case— Purchas Case—Plans of Church Reform—Ecclesi- astical Courts—Lord Shaftesbury—Court of Appeal— Diary	86
--	-----------

CHAPTER XXII.

1870-1873.

The Athanasian Creed	125
---------------------------------------	------------

CHAPTER XXIII.

CONFESSION—1873-1877.

Petition to Convocation in 1873. 'The Priest in Absolution,' 1877	163
--	------------

CHAPTER XXIV.

1874.

The Public Worship Regulation Act	186
--	------------

CHAPTER XXV.

RITUAL DISPUTES—1875-1879.

Folkestone—Hatcham—Wolverhampton—Bordesley	PAGE 236
--	-------------

CHAPTER XXVI.

GENERAL POLICY AND ACTION IN RITUAL MATTERS—

1875-1877.

Bishops' Pastoral—Ornaments Rubric in Convocation— Letter to Canon Carter—Ridsdale Judgment—Meet- ings for Unity—Croydon Church Congress	267
--	-----

CHAPTER XXVII.

1874-1878.

Extracts from Diaries, etc.—General Work and Home Life	301
---	-----

CHAPTER XXVIII.

1870-1880.

Colonial and Missionary Problems—Oath of Obedience— Madagascar—China—Ceylon—Second Lambeth Con- ference	337
---	-----

CHAPTER XXIX.

1877-1880.

The Burials Controversy	378
-----------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXX.

RITUALISM AND ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS—

1878-1882.

Ritual Questions in the Lambeth Conference of 1878—The Revised Rubrics—Speech at Westbere—Correspond- ence with the Government—Ecclesiastical Courts Commission—Mr. Green's Imprisonment—The Mac- konochie Correspondence	413
---	-----

CONTENTS.

vii

CHAPTER XXXI.

GENERAL SPEECHES AND LETTERS—1876-1881.

	PAGE
Influence of His Speeches—St. Martin's League—C.E.T.S. —“Crises in the Church of England”—Mansion- House Speeches—Church Defence—Tribute to Wil- berforce and Selwyn—Royal Academy—Royal College of Music—Relation to Nonconformists	481

CHAPTER XXXII.

1879-1882.

Extracts from Diaries—Home Life, etc.	516
---	-----

CHAPTER XXXIII.

REMINISCENCES OF HIS LAST YEARS—1877-1882.

The Manner of his Work—The Nearing of the End—The Last Illness—The Call Home	551
---	-----

CHAPTER XXXIV.

1882-1883.

Addington Churchyard—The Mansion House—Two Epitaphs	598
--	-----

NOTE A	603
NOTE B	608
NOTE C	610
INDEX	615

CHAPTER XIX.

THE DISESTABLISHMENT OF THE IRISH CHURCH.

1869.

AT the moment when Archibald Campbell Tait succeeded to the Primacy, the public mind was occupied with a question exciting, perhaps, a wider interest than any other ecclesiastical controversy of our time.

When he received Mr. Disraeli's letter informing him that his name was to be submitted to the Queen, Parliament had already been dissolved, the general election was in a few days to begin, and the issue before the electors had been narrowed to the single question—Should the Irish Church be disestablished?

The nomination of Bishop Tait was thus one of Mr. Disraeli's last official acts, and when, on January 5th, 1869, the new Primate went to Osborne to do homage to the Queen, Mr. Gladstone had already been a month in office, with the knowledge that he had in the House of Commons a majority of more than a hundred members pledged to carry the verdict of the constituencies into immediate effect.

The subject of the Irish Church was one with which the new Archbishop was, both by education and temperament, peculiarly well qualified to deal. It was no mere denominational controversy, but one which had to do with the fundamental principles of polity in Church and State, and it thus affected, directly or indirectly, the

religious life of the nation as a whole. It was a subject, too, to which the Archbishop had given attention almost from his boyhood, and it was essentially one which admitted of other considerations besides those of simple right and wrong. English churchmen, equally loyal and fair-minded, might hold, and did hold, very different opinions upon a problem which demanded, for its due solution, not honesty and courage only, but wise and cautious statesmanship.

The delicate responsibilities of 1869 were the fitting inauguration of a primacy of fourteen years, to be marked from first to last by the exercise, behind the scenes, of a moderating influence upon public affairs. It was in the capacity of a wise Christian statesman, rather than of a champion in ecclesiastical battle-fields, that Tait was to make memorable his occupancy of St. Augustine's chair.

It became obvious at once that in the inevitable conflict about the Irish Church the Archbishop's task must be one of great personal responsibility, though none probably foresaw how intricate and serious it was actually to become. That his position in the controversy may be correctly understood, it is necessary to summarise briefly what had taken place in the previous Parliament.

For many years the Irish problem in its various forms had been in the forefront of political discussion, and the Irish Church Establishment had been the subject of inquiry by a Royal Commission, and of more than one distinct motion in the House of Commons. Mr. Gladstone's own adoption of the policy of Disestablishment had been first made evident¹ in a speech delivered on May 7, 1867, although he abstained from voting in the division which followed upon that debate. A year later,

¹ His relation to the question, however, had, as he maintained, been practically indicated for more than twenty years. See *Hansard*, March 30, 1868, p. 474.

upon a motion by Mr. Maguire, "That this House resolve itself into a Committee, with the view of taking into consideration the condition and circumstances of Ireland," he had spoken more decidedly, declaring, amid loud cheers, that "in order to the settlement of the question of the Irish Church, that Church, as a State Church, must cease to exist."¹ In consequence of this declaration, Mr. Maguire withdrew his motion, leaving it to Mr. Gladstone, as leader of the Liberal Party, to give effect to his emphatic words.

Accordingly, on March 23, 1868, Mr. Gladstone laid upon the table of the House of Commons his famous Resolutions in favour of the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. On the first division he obtained a majority of 60 against the Government. Subsequent divisions having confirmed and increased this majority, Mr. Disraeli announced, on May 4, that he had advised Her Majesty to dissolve Parliament in the coming autumn, in order that the opinion of the country might be taken on the great issue now before it. Public meetings on either side were immediately organised in London and elsewhere. A great meeting took place in St. James's Hall on Wednesday, May 6, under the presidency of Archbishop Longley, who was supported on the platform by an immense array of Bishops, Peers, and Members of Parliament.² A strong resolution against the "proposed Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Irish branch of the United Church of England and Ireland" was moved by Bishop Tait, who called upon the advocates of Disestablishment to make their meaning clear, pointing out that no practical scheme which could possibly work satisfactorily had yet been propounded, and that an attempt

¹ *Hansard*, March 16, 1868, p. 1764.

² Twenty-five Bishops (eleven of whom held English Sees) and forty-nine Peers were on the platform.

was being made for political purposes to unite in an attack upon the Church men whose opinions and intentions were irreconcilably at variance.

"Unfortunately," said he, "from some cause which we may divine, but which it would be wrong to mention—(cheers and laughter)—a vast number of persons find themselves committed in words to the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish branch of our United Church. You meet them in society and in the street, you listen to their speeches, and you ask them what they mean; and, whether it be their stupidity or ours, I declare it is impossible to find out what they do mean. I hold, therefore, that these high-sounding words which flow so glibly require to be logically examined and defined. . . . Some there are who use the word [Disendowment] with the distinct meaning that there shall no longer be in Ireland any such endowments at all. We know of the endowments given since the Reformation, and those of us who know Ireland personally are aware that there are endowments which were given only last year. . . . Is it for a moment to be supposed that these sums, or, say, the £150,000 with which the great Cathedral of Dublin was lately re-edified, shall be confiscated? Such a thing will never stand in the light of day. It won't be done, and it can't be done. (Loud cheers.)"

The following letter has reference to this meeting:—

The Bishop of London to Mr. Craufurd Tait.¹

"10 May 1868.

"MY DEAREST CRAUFURD,—. . . The incessant work of the last fortnight has rather knocked me up, and last Wednesday 'did for me' altogether. I began with a service for the admission of nurses and sisters at St. John's House, which lasted nearly two hours and a half, in a very crowded little chapel; then I had to hurry to Exeter Hall, where I had promised to make a short speech for the Bible Society, and as there were several thousands of people present, even a short speech took something

¹ Mr. C. Tait was then an undergraduate at Oxford.

out of me. Then I had an hour to think over what I had determined to say in the great Church and State meeting at St. James's Hall. I hope you have read the account of it. I never saw a meeting so wild with enthusiasm. The speakers had been carefully arranged so as to represent all parties, but the meeting did not seem much in a humour for anything that was not Protestant in their own sense. First there was an attempt to hiss down the Bishop of Oxford, only stopped by four able-bodied men seizing the chief hisser by the legs and arms and hurling him downstairs, and, lastly, when Dean Stanley insisted on telling them that he came forward as a Liberal of the Liberals, and kept harping on the merits of the Liberal Party, they roared at him till he stopped. But notwithstanding all this, the meeting was very important. The Archbishop of York, Lord Harrowby, and I myself, had full opportunity of setting forth our view that there was no need of destroying the Irish Church in order thoroughly to reform it, and Stanley's speech was very good, notwithstanding its premature conclusion, while the Bishop of Oxford was as eloquent and indiscreet as usual, and old Chelmsford was the only man who distinctly hoisted the 'No Surrender' flag. The meeting was over at 5, and we afterwards had the Abp. of Canterbury and the Chancellor, and Roundell Palmer, and 22 others to dinner, with some 200 in the evening. . . . This sort of thing is rather too much for one's physical strength, though very interesting. I have had my usual round of preaching, and confirming, and levées, and commission meetings, and consecrations going on through the fortnight, and a rest is now good for body and soul. London has been in a most excited state about politics. You will have read the pitched battle of Thursday between Bright and Disraeli. The whole tone of the debate, or rather 'row,' was very lowering to the H. of Commons. My speech on the Church-Rate Bill in H. of Lords on the 23d gave a good deal of offence to some of my Whig friends, but I thought it well to let them have a warning as to what they were about in exciting the Church against them. Gladstone fell foul of it somewhat savagely in moving his Irish Church Resolutions, but last Sunday your mother and I went to the little Church in Windmill Street which Mr. Kempe has built for the poor of St. James', and there found Mr. and Mrs. Gladstone taking refuge from the glare of London for a quiet Sunday morning, and as we all walked home together

I had some most amicable conversation with him. I wish he was not so strangely impetuous, for he is certainly a good Christian man. . . . I almost hope that something may be done to bring him to reason about not destroying but reforming the Irish Church. This, no doubt, is what the old Whigs really desire if they could only get Disraeli out. But enough of such matters for a Sunday; only I like to keep you informed of what I am thinking and doing. This day, 36 years ago, my father died. I heard of it in my rooms at Balliol the day after I had returned from the Easter vacation. I was then 20. I shall never forget how he used to write to me while I was at Glasgow, and how, though 48 years older than me, he was as much my companion as if he had been my brother. God bless and keep you. . . . Your affectionate,
A. C. LONDON."

A few weeks later Mr. Gladstone introduced and carried triumphantly through the House of Commons, in spite of Government opposition, a 'Suspensory Bill,' which provided that no new appointment should be made to any benefice or dignity which might now become vacant in the Church against which the sentence of destruction had gone forth. The Bill came to the House of Lords on June 25, and, after three nights' debate, the motion for its second reading was rejected by a majority of 95. The first evening's discussion was closed by a powerful speech from Bishop Tait. He earnestly urged upon the House the harm which such a Bill must inevitably do. For himself, he said, he was quite ready, after what had passed in the House of Commons, to consent to a "real *Suspensory* Bill,"—a Bill, that is, which should require all persons taking office in the Church before this question had been decided by Parliament to do so "subject to any pecuniary arrangement which Parliament may hereafter make," but he besought the House to refuse its sanction to Mr. Gladstone's proposed enactment that vacant spiritual offices in the Irish Church should, in the interim of uncertainty, not be filled up at

all. He did not, he said, ask for power to create new vested interests, but he did ask for liberty to the Church of Ireland to carry on her spiritual work uncrippled while the questions as to her future were still under discussion. It was, in his opinion, most unfair to prejudge by such a Bill a question which had not yet been submitted to the verdict of the constituencies. He for one believed, as he had said elsewhere, that the principle upon which alone such a Bill could be justified, namely, that it was clearly desirable to disestablish the Irish Church, was one upon which the House of Commons might well come to a different conclusion when its practical difficulties were considered in detail.

It was his last speech in the House of Lords as Bishop of London. On November 13 he was nominated to the Primacy. A fortnight later the constituencies had pronounced unmistakably in favour of Irish Disestablishment, and the Archbishop, loyally accepting the arbitrament to which he had himself appealed, declined thenceforward to stand in opposition to what was now the emphatic will of the nation, as declared by the almost unprecedented majority with which Mr. Gladstone had entered upon office in a Parliament chosen with direct reference to this very issue. The national verdict could no longer be regarded as open to question. Mr. Disraeli had himself recognised the fact by resigning office without waiting for the meeting of Parliament, and the time had come, in the Archbishop's opinion, when the friends of the Irish Church should set themselves to obtain such fair and equitable conditions as might mitigate the severity of the now inevitable blow. From the first it was obvious how much must depend, in the coming controversy, upon the attitude which he might adopt, both personally and as the representative of the English Bishops. From the strong

and successful stand he had made in the previous year against the Suspensory Bill, it was confidently anticipated by many of the opponents of Mr. Gladstone's policy that he might be counted upon as an uncompromising champion of their cause, and some of his correspondents knew him so little as to insist on the "impossibility" of his acting otherwise than at the bidding of Mr. Disraeli, to whom, as they argued, he owed his Primacy. Such arguments he treated with contemptuous silence, and it need scarcely be said that there was not in the controversies of that stormy spring the slightest approach to a suggestion on Mr. Disraeli's part that the Archbishop should do otherwise than follow the independent dictates of his conscience. The relation between Bishops and Prime Ministers had changed vastly for the better since the time when even Bishop Blomfield, his immediate predecessor in the See of London, had felt it necessary to apologise in the House of Lords for adopting a policy contrary to that of the Minister who had nominated him to his Bishopric.¹ Very different was the view now taken by those on whom rested the highest burden of responsibility. The new Parliament was to be opened on February 16, 1869. On that morning the Archbishop received the following autograph letter :—

"OSBORNE, 15 *Feb.* 1869.

"The Queen must write a few lines to the Archbishop of Canterbury on the subject of the Irish Church, which makes her very anxious.

"... The Queen has seen Mr. Gladstone, who shows the most conciliatory disposition. He seems to be really moderate in his views, and anxious, so far as he can properly and consistently do so, to meet the objections of those who would maintain the Irish Church. He at once assured the Queen of

¹ *Hansard*, April 2, 1829, p. 123.

his readiness—indeed, his anxiety—to meet the Archbishop and to communicate freely with him on the subject of this important question, and the Queen must express her earnest hope that the Archbishop will meet him in the same spirit. The Government can do nothing that would tend to raise a suspicion of their sincerity in proposing to disestablish the Irish Church, and to withdraw all State endowments from all religious communions in Ireland; but, were these conditions accepted, all other matters connected with the question might, the Queen thinks, become the subject of discussion and negotiation. The Archbishop had best now communicate with Mr. Gladstone direct as to when he can see him.”

A few letters extracted from the voluminous correspondence with the leaders of all parties which followed upon the Queen's request will show what were the Archbishop's own views, and how far he was enabled to give effect to them:—

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Right Hon.
W. E. Gladstone.*

“LAMBETH PALACE, 16 Feb'y. 1869.

“MY DEAR MR. GLADSTONE,—I have received this day a letter from the Queen, informing me of your desire to see me on the subject of the Irish Church, and conveying Her Majesty's command that I should write to ask when I can have an interview with you. I need scarcely assure you that it is my earnest desire to assist in any way in my power in the solution of the difficult questions now at issue, if this can be done consistently with the principles to which I am sincerely attached, and to which I have given public expression. I shall therefore be truly glad to have an interview at any time you may appoint, and am at your service at any hour to-morrow, except from 4 to 6. I have no authority to speak on the part either of the Irish or the English Prelates, but, looking to the acquaintance which circumstances have given me with the sentiments of both, it is possible I may be of some use. Only I apprehend this is important: that as the Irish Bishops have the body of the Irish clergy and laity in some sort as their constituents, and as no English Bishops can speak on such matters merely as individuals,

but must appear to stand forth from the body of which the Bishops are the spiritual heads, whatever passes should be so expressed on my part that it may be recorded to show the exact line which I have taken in reference to this perplexing question.—Believe me to be, my dear Mr. Gladstone, very truly yours,

“A. C. CANTUAR.”

*The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone to the
Archbishop of Canterbury.*

“11 CARLTON HOUSE TERRACE, Feb. 18, /69.

“MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I am much obliged by your Grace’s letter, which a heavily charged afternoon did not permit me duly to answer yesterday. Her Majesty signified to me the satisfaction it would give her if I saw your Grace on the subject of the Irish Church. I explained to the Queen that I had sought for communication with the Irish Bench, as immediately affected by the intended measure, and likewise with some members of the English Bench, whose silence last year, or whose recognition of the altered circumstances of the case, or any other special ground, gave me a title to approach them, but that I had not felt myself warranted in so approaching your Grace, or others of whom I knew nothing except the adverse opinions declared and acted on last spring and summer. This lack on my part the Queen kindly undertook to remove. If it be agreeable to your Grace I will call at Lambeth Palace to-morrow at twelve.—I remain respectfully, your Grace’s most faithfully,

“W. E. GLADSTONE.”

The Archbishop had made up his mind with the utmost clearness upon certain conditions which he deemed essential to any equitable settlement, and not knowing what form his conversation with the Prime Minister might take, he embodied them in a written form. The document is headed—

“LAMBETH PALACE, 19 Feb. 1869.

“MEMORANDUM prepared before my interview with Mr. Gladstone, but not read to him, as the interview took the form of an exposition of his policy by Mr. G., which from time to time I interrupted by remarks based on this memorandum.”

The pith of the Memorandum is contained in the following sentences :—

“The Archbishop believes that, unless the following conditions can be observed, the contemplated changes in Ireland will leave in the minds of Irish Churchmen a deep feeling of injustice, which will not be healed in the present generation, which may embitter parties in Ireland against each other more than at present, and render the task of governing the country very difficult.

“1st, That churches at present used for Protestant worship shall not be given to the Roman Catholics without the consent of the authorities of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Ireland.

“2d, That glebe-houses, having been all built long since the Reformation, and maintained from time to time at the expense of Protestants, shall not be given to Roman Catholics without the same consent.

“3d, That property of which the Protestant Episcopal Church in Ireland has become possessed since the Reformation, and which has been given to it with the view of maintaining the Reformed Faith, shall be preserved.

“4th, That steps shall be taken to preserve the outward continuity of the present Irish (Protestant Episcopal) Church, *i.e.* to secure that the body to be dealt with in making new arrangements shall not be a new corporate body to be constituted by a voluntary act, but as far as possible the same body which has been known hitherto as the Irish branch of the United Church of England and Ireland.”

Mr. Gladstone had not as yet made public any authoritative statement of the shape which his Disestablishment policy was to assume,¹ but some of his lieutenants had in their election speeches foreshadowed an Act so sweeping as to set at naught every one of the four points on which the Archbishop here laid stress. The greater, therefore, was the Archbishop's satisfaction as he listened in this memorable interview to Mr. Gladstone's exposition—the virtual rehearsal of his great speech,—and found that on

¹ He had merely sketched it in outline in his speech of March 30, 1868.

each of these points Mr. Gladstone's proposed policy was in practical accord with the conditions he had himself laid down. The safeguards promised did not indeed go so far as the Archbishop would have wished, but the principle was in each case admitted, and the following letter shows that his graver apprehensions had been not a little allayed :—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Her Majesty the Queen.

“ LAMBETH PALACE, 22 Feb. 1869.

“ The Archbishop of Canterbury presents his humble duty to your Majesty, and having, by your Majesty's command, had an interview with Mr. Gladstone, begs leave to report to your Majesty.

“ The Archbishop of Canterbury has had the advantage of an interview with the Bishop of Peterborough this evening, and knows from conversation the present views of the Irish Prelates generally, though he has of course considered all that Mr. Gladstone stated to him as strictly confidential. One point in the proposed scheme of dealing with the Irish Church on which Mr. Gladstone dwelt seems to the Archbishop as of very great importance, and it was a great relief to his mind to find that Mr. Gladstone suggested it : namely, that all the existing laws of the United Church of England and Ireland, except so far as they must necessarily be modified by the very fact of the severance of direct connection with the State, are intended to be retained as the compact according to which all matters respecting the affairs of the Irish Church under its altered circumstances shall be regulated, unless the governing body of the Irish Church in its new capacity shall deliberately, with the proper consents, modify any of such laws. The Archbishop considers that this proposal, being fairly acted upon and rigidly adhered to, may save one great evil to be apprehended from the contemplated changes : namely, the cutting of the Irish Church, so to speak, adrift, to form itself into a totally new outward society, a process which might have been attended with great danger to its unity, and might possibly have led to its disruption into two or more bodies. Everything which preserves the historical and legal connec-

tion of the altered Irish Church with the present Irish branch of the United Church, the Archbishop considers as of vital importance.

"The Archbishop is not without hope that after the contemplated changes the Irish Church may voluntarily express its desire to keep up its connection with the Church of England, even in the matter of appointments to high offices. But he is now convinced that a proposal made at present to retain the right of such appointments, as a condition imposed by the Imperial Parliament, would probably excite opposition in Ireland, and might even frustrate its own object by making that appear an ungracious condition forced on the Church from without, which may perhaps be willingly claimed by the Church as a privilege when, as time goes on, the difficulties and disadvantages of complete independence are fully seen.

"The Archbishop of Canterbury greatly regrets the unwillingness manifested to retain for the Protestant Episcopal Church all the post-Reformation grants and bequests, and he cannot but think that Mr. Gladstone has miscalculated the amount of opposition which his proposals in the matter will meet with when lands granted since the Reformation for the distinct purpose of maintaining Protestantism are deliberately alienated. The Irish Bishops will certainly take the sense of Parliament on this question. A similar remark applies to some of Mr. Gladstone's intentions respecting the disposal of churches and glebe-houses. The plan for dealing with them appears to the Archbishop complicated, and likely to cause a great deal of irritation.

"Respecting the application of the surplus, the Archbishop thinks it unnecessary for him to express any opinion, except that he would gladly have found that it was intended that any funds which are to be diverted from distinctly religious purposes might be devoted to remedying the peculiar social and moral evils under which Ireland has long suffered.

"The Archbishop is much relieved to find that the Suspensory Bill now to be proposed will not be liable to the objections felt against that of last year, but will provide for filling up all offices which may become vacant, guarding only against the creation of fresh pecuniary life-interests. To maintain the principle of filling up the offices where the authorities of the Church recommend it seems to the Archbishop of much importance.

"The Archbishop hears with the greatest satisfaction from

Mr. Gladstone that he is anxious to arrange the calculation of the life-interests of the present holders of benefices in Ireland in such a manner as shall be most advantageous, not to the individuals concerned, but to the Irish Church at large, and he will recommend the Irish clergy to enter, so far as they consistently can, into negotiations with Mr. Gladstone on this point.

"The Archbishop of Canterbury begs leave to thank your Majesty for this opportunity of expressing his sentiments on the proposed measure, and desires humbly to express his wish to aid in any way in his power in bringing about a solution of the complicated questions involved in the proposals now made in such a manner as may be most satisfactory to your Majesty."

The Archbishop used to say in after years that his position during the ten days which followed upon the interview which has been described was the most difficult he had ever known. In addition to the necessarily urgent correspondence of such a time, he had to grant interviews to men of every sort and condition, who came to consult, inform, or interrogate him upon the absorbing topic which was on every lip; and he had not merely to give attention to their eager comments and conjectures, and to say something suitable in reply, but to keep entirely secret all the while the scheme which Mr. Gladstone had unfolded to him, and even the fact that such a communication had taken place. Convocation, too, was in session during four days of the intervening week, bringing all the dignitaries of the Church to London, and many of them to Lambeth. He had to take his place in Convocation for the first time as its President, and thus, as he expressed it, "every loophole of escape from the inquisitors was closely barred."

At last, on Monday, March 1, the House of Commons was put in possession of the Government plan, and the Archbishop's mouth was opened. No earlier or subsequent effort will hereafter eclipse the fame of Mr. Gladstone's feat in holding the eager attention of the House

of Commons for some three hours and a half while he unfolded by degrees what would in any other hands have been the dry and complicated details of his Bill. From the crowded gallery Archbishop Tait watched the exposition to an enthusiastic House of the proposals to which he had himself listened ten days before. In barest possible outline it may perhaps be well to state them here, in order that the subsequent discussions may be better understood.

Mr. Gladstone laid down as essential conditions of his measure "that the system of Church Establishment in Ireland must be brought thoroughly and completely to a close," and that, while a liberal and even indulgent rule should be followed in all the details of its application, the enactment should yet be prompt in its operation, and final in every respect. The actual moment of Disestablishment he proposed to postpone until January 1, 1871, but from the passing of the Act the creation of vested interests was to cease, and the property of the Church was to pass at once into the hands of Commissioners appointed for the purpose. On these Commissioners would devolve the task of providing for the necessary compensation of vested interests, and of negotiating with such governing body as the clergy and laity of the Disestablished Church might agree in creating from among themselves. All the ecclesiastical laws of the Established Church were to subsist as a binding contract to regulate the internal affairs of the Disestablished Church until such time as they should be altered by the voluntary agency of whatever new governing body might be appointed. The churches and burial-grounds were to become, on application, the property of the Disestablished Church; and the houses of residence, or, as they were usually termed, 'glebe-houses,' were to be handed over in the same

manner to the Church's governing body on payment of the somewhat heavy building charges existing upon them.

Estimating the whole capital value of the Church's property from tithes, glebes, and other permanent sources at £16,000,000, Mr. Gladstone estimated that about £8,500,000 would be swallowed up in the necessary compensation of various kinds, and that about $7\frac{1}{2}$ millions would remain to be applied to other objects, in accordance with the carefully drawn preamble of the Bill, which stated that such money was to be used "for the advantage of the Irish people, but not for the maintenance of any Church or clergy or other ministry, nor for the teaching of religion." The system and rate of compensation to be applied to life-interests was obviously a matter of the highest importance ; and it was upon this question that many of the subsequent difficulties arose. In the case of incumbents holding a freehold benefice, the calculation of life-interests, according to Mr. Gladstone's plan, was comparatively simple ; but there were in the Church of Ireland hundreds of unbeneficed curates whose life-interests, from a professional point of view, were very difficult to estimate. The provisions under this head were intricate in the extreme, but, speaking roughly, it may be said that a capital sum of about £800,000 was to be applied to the compensation of unbeneficed curates, who were divided into two classes, distinguished by Mr. Gladstone as permanent and transitory, each class being dealt with according to a distinct principle of compensation.

As to the post-Reformation grants, on which the Archbishop had laid stress, Mr. Gladstone, to the general surprise, fixed a dividing-line at the year 1660, agreeing that all grants made from private sources subsequent to that year should be handed over intact to the Disestablished Church.

The utmost curiosity had been aroused as to Mr. Gladstone's plan for the disposal of the surplus funds remaining after the necessary compensations. He now announced his intention that this sum, estimated at about seven and a half millions capital, or £311,000 per annum, should be devoted to the relief of "unavoidable calamities and suffering not provided for by the poor-law," and he allocated it in different proportions to the support of lunatic and idiot asylums, institutions for the deaf, dumb, and blind, and other kindred objects. These details were, one after another, set forth with marvellous clearness, and the great speech was closed with a peroration which drew a warm tribute of admiration even from the keenest opponents of the Bill.

The debates which followed were among the most famous of modern times, but it would be obviously out of place to recount them here. On March 23 the second reading of the Bill was carried in the House of Commons by 368 votes against 250, and Parliament immediately adjourned for the Easter recess.

The sparsely kept diary of these busy weeks does not give much additional information :—

"Shrove Tuesday, Feb. 9.—Occupied all day with Bishops' meeting. . . . The Irish Bishops made a very good exposition of their policy. Very solemn our meeting in the old room without the old chief."

"Sunday, 7 March.— . . . We have had an anxious week in Convocation; much grave anxiety about the Irish Church. It was strange to hear Gladstone last Monday unfold his scheme in the House of Commons, knowing beforehand what it was all to be, and having indeed had a rehearsal of it in my library."

"Sunday, March 14, 10.45 P.M.—This last week has been spent as follows :—Monday 8th, innumerable engagements to see clergy. Went at 3 with Archbishop of Dublin to Disraeli

to hear his views about the policy to be pursued respecting the Irish Church Bill. He is bent on doing his best to set the Liberal party by the ears on Thursday next. Looks for a set of speeches which will show utter dissension amid professed agreement; does not expect to oppose the second reading successfully, but to shatter the enemy, and perhaps to play over again the game with which he destroyed Lord Russell's Reform Bill. He did not rise to my suggestions about rescuing the post-Reformation grants, but seemed to hope that an Establishment of a reduced kind might be saved."

No sooner was the second reading carried in the House of Commons than Mr. Disraeli wrote as follows :—

The Right Hon. B. Disraeli to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"GROSVENOR GATE, March 24, 1869.

"MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—The majority last night was expected. It created no enthusiasm; it was a mechanical majority. The new House has fulfilled its pledge, and the same force cannot be counted on by the Government on matters of comparative detail. What is of importance now is the course to be pursued by the House of Lords. I write to your Grace not as the leader of a party, or as a candidate for power, but as a public man, deeply anxious to maintain, and, if possible, strengthen the status of the Established Church. Whatever the Lords ultimately decide on, their conduct to the world should be brave, firm, unflinching. It seems to me of the last importance that the action of the Lords should be divested, as far as possible, of any appearance of party purpose and organisation. It should be originated by some great personage, representing the Church, or by some lay Peer who occupies a neutral position in general politics. The tellers of the division should not be party tellers. What is most desirable is that as soon as practicable after the holidays¹ there should be a meeting of some leading Peers to consider the position. They should not be called together by any recognised party leader, and yet they should meet under the most authoritative circumstances. They should not be numerous

¹ Parliament adjourned for the Easter Recess on March 23.

—a council of a dozen or so. Lord Cairns should be asked to attend of course, not only as the representative of the majority, but of inestimable service in counsel. Lord Derby should be invited, Lord Salisbury, and, I think, Lord Bath. Lord Westbury should be requested to attend, probably Lord Grey, certainly Lord Harrowby.

“What do you think of inviting these noblemen to confer with you at Lambeth? I entertain the opinion that such an invitation would be highly advantageous to the Church. . . .

“Every day will make us comprehend more clearly what is the real feeling of England. It is on a just appreciation of that that the right decision will depend. . . .—Believe me ever, my dear Lord Archbishop, sincerely yours, B. DISRAELI.”

The Archbishop readily agreed, and after some further correspondence the proposed Conference was held at Lambeth Palace on Saturday, May 8, when eight lay Peers, belonging to different political camps, laid before the Archbishop their divergent views, and received his counsel. They failed, however, as the Archbishop's memorandum¹ shows, to come to any agreement upon the best course to be pursued, some of them objecting in the strongest terms to the Archbishop's proposal that the Bill should be read a second time and then materially amended in Committee. Lord Salisbury, Lord Stanhope, and Lord Grey seem to have stood alone in supporting the Archbishop.

Meantime the Bill was on its way through the House of Commons. It was a surprise both to friends and foes to find that Mr. Gladstone was able to carry the whole Liberal party with him on the details as well as the principle of his measure. The various amendments moved in Committee were rejected by immense majorities, and the Bill's final shape was almost identical with what it had been at its introduction two months before. On May 31

¹ He preserved a careful paper setting out briefly the views of all those present at the Conference.

it was read a third time in the House of Commons, and sent up to the House of Lords, whose reception of it was anxiously awaited by the country.

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Right Hon.

W. E. Gladstone.

"LAMBETH PALACE, S.E., 3 June 1869.

"MY DEAR MR. GLADSTONE,—I have received the Queen's commands to put myself into communication with you, in case you should wish me to be of any use in negotiating with the leaders of the majority in the House of Lords, and thus endeavouring to avoid that collision between the Houses of Parliament which, I am sorry to think, now seems imminent. Her Majesty has grounded this expression of her wishes on what she conceives to be your desire, as conveyed to her in an interview, in which you pointed to the possibility of some of the Bishops being of use in being the vehicle of intercommunication between the two parties in the present emergency. I have made no secret of my conviction, under the present aspect of affairs, that the wise course for the House of Lords at present to follow (though unwillingly) will be, not to prevent the second reading of the Irish Church Bill, but to endeavour materially to alter it in Committee. I consider the country to have expressed its opinion in favour of the general policy of your Bill, but not on the question of how much disendowment the Disestablishment of the Irish Church implies. I should therefore urge the House of Lords to give all its attention to saving as large an endowment as possible.

"But then we are met by the difficulty that no material amendments will be listened to by the Government, and under this impression the majority of the House of Lords will (unless they can be disabused of it) insist, and with great force, that there is no use conceding the second reading. It appears to me that at this moment negotiation is possible; but that after the meeting at the Duke of Marlborough's on Saturday it will be scarcely possible.

"Perhaps you may not think that I am of any use, but I have no alternative except to write this letter.—Believe me to be,
yours very truly,

A C. CANTUAR."

*The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone to the
Archbishop of Canterbury.*

“ 11 CARLTON H. TERRACE, *June 3, 1869.*

“MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—In reply to your Grace’s letter, I have to say that any communication from you, and especially one made with the direct sanction or authority of Her Majesty, commands my most respectful attention. I feel a difficulty in saying anything about amendments in the Irish Church Bill with the particular view of acting, or enabling others to act, on the decision of the House of Lords on the second reading of the Irish Church Bill. Not only with reference to party interests, but with reference to the interests of conclusive settlement, a rejection of the Bill on the second reading is not the worst of the alternatives that may be before us. It is eminently desirable, indeed, that the Bill should be read a second time. But if I compare two methods, both inexpedient—one, that of rejection on the second reading; the other, that of a second reading followed by amendments inconsistent with the principle—I know no argument in favour of the latter, except what relates to the very important question of the position and true interest of the House of Lords itself. As far as I know the mind of the House of Commons on the subject of the Bill, there is not that distinction between the questions of Disestablishment and Disendowment which exists in your Grace’s mind. A distinction there may be, but it does not, I think, amount to more than this—that whereas Disestablishment is absolute and uniform, the rule of Disendowment admits of certain exceptions upon very marked and special grounds, such as those recognised in the provisions respecting churches, private endowments, and (to a very large extent) glebe-houses; perhaps also in the very wide construction which has been given, on the doctrine of sympathy rather than doctrine of vested interests, in the cases of the curates, permanent and non-permanent. For the grounds of such exceptions we have sought with care; that not one has escaped our notice I will not venture to affirm; but my opinion is that the House of Commons will not recognise changes in the Bill, except they can be brought within the character which I have given.—Your Grace’s most faithfully,

“W. E. GLADSTONE.”

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Right Hon.
W. E. Gladstone.*

"LAMBETH PALACE, S.E., June 4, 1869.

"MY DEAR MR. GLADSTONE,—I beg to thank you for your answer to my letter of yesterday. On considering what you say, I think it might be inconvenient, and scarcely fair to the Government, to lay before you at this stage any specific amendments on the Irish Church Bill, seeing that, if such were carried in the House of Lords, so much as to the reception they ought to receive in the House of Commons would depend on the circumstances under which they were carried in the Lords, and the arguments by which they were enforced.

"I shall content myself, therefore, with having fulfilled the duty imposed on me by the Queen, of putting myself in communication with you on the subject, and with assuring you again of my hearty desire to act in the capacity which Her Majesty has suggested, if I can be of any use in averting, what I am well aware that you consider likely to be, a grievous evil to the country, viz., a direct collision between the two Houses of Parliament on this momentous question.—Yours very truly,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Lord Cairns.

"LAMBETH PALACE, June 4, 1869.

"MY DEAR LORD,—Since I saw you yesterday I have had a long conversation with the Archbishop of York, and I find that we still agree in our estimate of what ought to be done in the present very difficult crisis. The Archbishop of York will of course speak for himself, and though there is every probability of our acting together, we are not pledged to do so. But the result of our deliberation is that I am strengthened in my opinion, expressed at our meeting at Lambeth, that the rejection of the second reading of the Irish Church Bill in the House of Lords, especially if it be by a small majority, to which the members of the Episcopal Bench largely contribute, will be far more dangerous for the Irish Church than the passing of the second reading could be. It seems certain that many persons adverse to the

Bill would prefer standing aside and allowing it to be taken in hand by the House of Lords, with the view of its being materially amended ; and it is probable that, notwithstanding any decision which may be adopted to divide the House on the second reading, many will so stand aside, and that the majority will not be great. But even if it was great, we should in all probability have the same Bill back in three months.

“Now, surely the Irish Church is likely to receive better handling from the House of Lords than from the House of Commons ; and at this particular stage the House of Lords might take the Bill into its own hands and do a great deal to avert the evils which the Bill unmitigated must inflict. At present any modifications we made in the Bill must be respectfully considered by the House of Commons, however much Mr. Gladstone might dislike them, and the country would to a great degree be on our side ; but if this present opportunity of getting the matter into our own hands be not seized, I have great fears that when parties become more exasperated by a collision between the two Houses, such another opportunity will not return, and the year will scarcely end without our seeing the Bill, unmitigated, become law. In my judgment, then, we have an opportunity of now mitigating the evils of the Bill, which it is dangerous to let slip. This opinion, I am sure, is shared by many of my Episcopal brethren, who are among the most anxious to preserve as much as possible of what is valuable in the institutions of the Irish Church. I have thought that in the view of your meeting to-morrow you would like to be in possession of my opinion after another day's anxious deliberation. Though this letter is private, you are at liberty, at your discretion, to make what you should please of its contents.—Yours sincerely,
A. C. CANTUAR.”

General Grey to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“BALMORAL, *June 4th*, 1869.

“MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I write to your Grace by the Queen's command. You must be well aware, from your former communication with Her Majesty on the subject, of the great anxiety which the question of the Irish Church causes her, and will therefore not wonder at the desire to learn what your Grace thinks of the prospect of the question being settled during the

progress through the House of Lords of the Bill which has just been sent up from the House of Commons.

"Mr. Gladstone is not ignorant (indeed the Queen has never concealed her feelings on the subject) how deeply H. M. deploras the necessity under which he conceived himself to lie of raising the question as he has done, or of the apprehensions, of which she cannot divest herself, as to the possible consequences of the measure which he has introduced.

"These apprehensions, H. M. is bound to say, still exist in full force. But considering the circumstances under which the measure has come to the House of Lords, the Queen cannot regard, without the greatest alarm, the probable effect of its absolute rejection in that House.

"Carried as it has been by an overwhelming and steady majority, through a House of Commons chosen expressly to speak the feeling of the country on the question, there seems no reason to believe that any fresh appeal to the People could lead to a different result.

"The rejection of the Bill, therefore, on the second reading would only serve to bring the two Houses into collision, and to prolong a dangerous agitation of the subject, while it would further tend to increase the difficulty of ultimately obtaining a measure so modified as to remove, or at least to mitigate, the fears of those who are conscientiously opposed to the present Bill as it stands.

"Her Majesty was consequently glad to hear, though she knows not whether it was on very good authority, that the leaders of the Opposition are disposed to advise acquiescence in the second reading rather than incur the greater dangers to which I have alluded, in the hope of being able in Committee to amend the Bill, so as to make the measure less objectionable.

"The Queen well knows how anxious your Grace must be to assist in bringing about a settlement of the question—if not altogether such as you would have desired, at least the best possible under the circumstances; and she feels sure, therefore, that the great influence of your Grace's high character and station will be used on the side of prudence and moderation.

"Her Majesty desires me to add that she will be very glad to receive any communication which you may think it desirable to address to her direct.—I remain, my dear Lord, your Grace's very faithful servt.,

C. GREY."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Her Majesty the Queen.

"HARRIETSHAM, 6 June 1869.

"The Archbishop of Canterbury presents his humble duty to your Majesty. He has this morning received General Grey's letter of the 4th, written by your Majesty's command. The Archbishop of Canterbury has put himself during the last week into direct communication with Mr. Gladstone, as he understood your Majesty desired, but not as yet with any definite result.

"The Archbishop fully understood, till within the last few days, that the leaders of the Opposition would not place any obstacle in the way of the Irish Church Bill passing the second reading in the House of Lords, though of course it would be impossible for them, or others who feel as they do, to vote for the second reading. There seemed, therefore, till within the last few days, every probability of the Bill being taken in hand by the House of Lords with a view to its material amendment.

"Unfortunately, however, the leaders of the Opposition seem to have been overpowered by their followers; and yesterday, at a great meeting of some 150 Conservative Peers at the Duke of Marlborough's house, it was agreed to oppose the second reading, Lord Harrowby having undertaken to move the rejection of the Bill. Lord Cairns has (apparently reluctantly) come into this view, and Lord Derby appears strongly to approve of it.

"The Archbishop, of course, was not present at this meeting; but, having been obliged to spend the Sunday in his diocese, he received this morning a full account of all that passed.

"Lord Salisbury, Lord Stanhope, Lord Carnarvon, apparently almost alone, spoke against the policy of rejection, and the Archbishop hopes to see these Peers, with the Archbishop of York and Lord Grey, on his return to town to-morrow evening.

"The Archbishop is not without hopes that a considerable body may abstain from voting. It is therefore possible, though scarcely probable, that the second reading may be carried, and that such a treatment of the Bill by amendment as the Archbishop desires may yet be found possible. No doubt such a result would be greatly facilitated if Lord Granville would in any way answer to the House, in the name of the Government, that amendments would be respectfully considered. The Archbishop begs to assure your Majesty that he will use his utmost endea-

vours to promote that conciliatory policy which your Majesty has at heart. He will not fail to communicate to your Majesty by Tuesday what is the result of any conference he is able to hold to-morrow evening with Lord Salisbury and others."

The Archbishop had thus maintained from the first that the Bill ought to be read a second time in the House of Lords, and then amended in Committee. But it was now becoming clear that this course would by no means approve itself to the Conservative leaders.

Lord Cairns to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"5 CROMWELL HOUSES,
"Sunday night, 6 June.

"MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,— . . . The conclusion arrived at by the meeting of Conservative Peers was that the second reading of the Irish Church Bill should be opposed, and Lord Harrowby will move its rejection.

"I am told that there is an article to-day in the *Observer*, which may be regarded as a Government organ, stating in so many words that any amendment of the Bill which H.M. Ministers may not accept will be tantamount to the rejection of the Bill, and be attended by the identical consequences. This is not very encouraging for the course, which Lord Salisbury and a few others are disposed to recommend, of letting the second reading pass, and making amendments.—Believe me, your Grace's faithful servant,
CAIRNS."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Her Majesty the Queen.

"LAMBETH PALACE, 7 June 1869.

"The Archbishop of Canterbury presents his humble duty to your Majesty, and begs leave to lay before your Majesty what he finds to be the state of matters since his return to town this evening. The majority of the Conservative party in the House of Lords may be considered to be about 60, though the Irish Church (Suspensory) Bill of last year was rejected by 90. Of this body, a section, headed by Lord Salisbury, Lord Stanhope,

and Lord Devon, and including Lord Bath and several others of the distinctly Conservative party, will not vote for the rejection of the second reading of the Irish Church Bill. Many, feeling it impossible to vote for the second reading, will stand aside and not vote. The calculation given to the Archbishop, on apparently good authority, is that probably the majority against the second reading will be reduced to 20. Under these circumstances, it is quite possible that, fearing a weak majority, the Conservative leaders will rather acquiesce in a defeat which would leave them clear to insist upon amendments. From an interview which the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Archbishop of York have had to-day with Lord Granville, there seems reason to hope that the Ministry would not act so unreasonably as to object to all amendments. . . . It appears to the Archbishop that the fate of the second reading is very much in the hands of the Ministry themselves, and he has pressed this on Lord Granville. If a conciliatory speech introduces the measure, intimating a readiness on the part of the Ministry to consider any amendments made by the House of Lords, though it would be impossible for persons feeling as the Archbishop of Canterbury does to vote for the second reading, a large body would stand aside, and the second reading might very possibly be carried. . . . The Archbishop cannot doubt that Lord Granville is perfectly alive to the gravity of the occasion and the necessity of conciliation, and that any representation from your Majesty would make it almost impossible for him to avoid adopting this wise and conciliatory tone. The Archbishop of Canterbury will not fail to do what he can, during the rest of the week, in the hope of being able to secure that the House of Lords has an opportunity of endeavouring to amend the Bill."

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to the
Right Hon. B. Disraeli.*

"LAMBETH PALACE, 8 June 1869.

"MY DEAR MR. DISRAELI,—I ought to mention to you that I have had communications from the Queen, in which Her Majesty expresses the strong hope that the Irish Church Bill may be allowed to pass the second reading in the House of Lords, with a view to its being amended. I am still of the same opinion which

I expressed at the Lambeth meeting, that this is the wisest course, and most for the interest of the Irish Church. If, as I am informed, the majority in the Lords against the second reading is not likely to exceed 20, would it not be wise, even now, to influence some of your friends, so as to secure to the Lords the power of dealing with the measure in its details? I cannot but hope, from what I hear, that Lord Granville will introduce the measure in a conciliatory speech, so as to give good grounds for believing that amendments materially altering the Bill will be respectfully considered. . . . —Yours very truly,

“A.C. CANTUAR.”

As the day drew near which had been fixed for the Lords' debate upon the second reading, the Archbishop received letters by every post, many of them from trusted and honoured friends, solemnly adjuring him not to betray the Church by allowing the second reading to be carried. On the morning of the debate, for example, the following reached him, written by one from whom, to use his own words, he “never differed without pain” :—

“ . . . After long hesitation I feel compelled to write. . . . The advocates of the Bill have been actively circulating a report that neither of the English Archbishops will divide against the second reading. . . . It fills our hearts with utter dismay to think of the possibility that the Prelates of the English branch of the Church should at once desert their Irish brethren. Who can tell how much our present inheritance may have depended on the firmness of ‘the Seven Bishops’? . . . I ask then, Could a greater calamity happen than that the heads of our Church should thus desert us in the hour of need? I earnestly implore you to listen to me and to forgive me. God knows it has been bitter enough to feel it to be my duty to labour night and day against my life-long friend, the author of the Bill; . . . but I believe from my heart that this whole policy is fraught with the most fatal dangers to our Church and country.”

Another friend appeals to him “in Christ's holy name to spare our feelings, and to save us from the taunts of

the wicked, by abstaining from sanctioning this ungodly measure."

The debate began on Monday, June 14, and the Archbishop spoke on the first evening. His speech differed widely from the magnificent displays of oratory which marked that memorable debate. It was a simple and straightforward exposition of the policy to which, since the verdict of the constituencies had been announced, he had consistently adhered. A few sentences to show its purport are all that it is possible to quote :—

"My Lords—the two noble Earls who first addressed the House to-night very naturally appealed to the Right Reverend Bench—one warning us that unless we gave our assistance in passing this measure we should greatly injure the Church of England, through the Church of Ireland; the other telling us that unless we helped to throw out this measure on the second reading our conduct would have the same result. . . . Now, my Lords, putting the matter to my own conscience, and endeavouring to decide what is best to be done in this particular emergency, I cannot agree either with those who advise us to accept the measure that is now before us, without alteration, or with those who advise us at once to cast it aside. . . . Neither can I quite concur with the noble and learned Lord (Lord Romilly) in the view he took with reference to the security of property. He is entitled to consider himself a far better judge on such subjects than I am, but at the same time I could not help thinking there was a little paradox in the statement that to confiscate some millions of property was a good way of giving security to property. On that point, however, I am no match for the noble and learned Lord. But with regard to the advantage to religion of confiscating the property dedicated to the service of religion from ancient times, and breaking up and utterly abolishing the old institutions which for centuries have been devoted to the propagation of religion, I think myself entitled to retain my opinion that religion will be more likely to flourish under such endowments than without them. I grant there is a sort of religion which does flourish in the absence of endowments. There is a sort of spurious religion which lives on the passions

of the people. The curse of Ireland is the repeated political and religious agitation on which Voluntarism necessarily rests. That is the great bane of Ireland, which I hope your Lordships will not encourage; and so far as this measure, if carried without serious amendments, would encourage agitation, so far I consider it a measure fraught with the worst possible consequences. . . . The important question now is, What is to be done? I cannot help thinking that this, the real question, has not been very much touched upon in the course of the present debate. If any one had come accidentally into this House, he would have thought that nothing whatever had happened since this time last year. But a great deal has happened, and in approaching the question we should consider what has happened, and what it is possible for us now to do. I am certain your Lordships will not listen for one moment to the taunt, that if you pass the second reading of this measure, you will show yourself to be an altogether powerless portion of the Legislature. Those who utter such taunts desire to make you powerless; and they are the friends of this House, in my estimation, who tell us to consider what the country has determined, and to make the measure—bad as I believe it to be—not so bad as it is now. . . . I venture to think, my Lords, though perhaps I stand alone on the Right Reverend Bench in entertaining the opinion—that it would be a great advantage to the country if this measure could in its details have the benefit of your Lordships' full consideration. . . . There are probably two months more of this session remaining, and I cannot but think that this House, comprising among its members the heads of the Law and the heads of the Church, . . . is much more likely to arrive at a satisfactory policy on this question than can be arrived at by any amount of agitation at meetings held either in Manchester or in Ireland. Though the policy I venture to recommend may not conciliate those who desire to destroy this House and its legitimate influence in the nation, though it may not conciliate the Ultramontane Roman Catholics on the one hand, or the violent political dissenters on the other, yet I feel assured that you will carry with you the sympathies of the moderate Roman Catholics both in this country and in Ireland, . . . and will earn the gratitude of those who are the very sinews and heart of the people of Ireland, the Protestants of the North. If you are able thus to construct a measure dealing with this great

subject, I am sure it will not be merely in words that the people of this country will now, as they did once before, thank God that they have a House of Lords.”¹

There can be no question that this speech contributed materially to influence the issue of the debate. What was described as its “practical good sense and patriotism” made an impression both in the House and in the country, which was not removed even by the eloquence of the Bishop of Peterborough, whose magnificent speech on the following evening, in favour of the absolute rejection of the Bill, placed him at one bound in the foremost rank of the Parliamentary orators of our time.

The division took place on Friday, June 18th, or rather, to speak accurately, at three o'clock on Saturday morning. Until the last moment the result was quite uncertain. It was broad daylight, but the galleries were still crowded with the brilliant audience who had listened to the long debate. Upon a division being called, the two English Archbishops, amid a scene of intense excitement, retired to the steps of the Throne, which are technically not within the House. Bishop Wilberforce and several Conservative Peers withdrew. Among the Conservatives who voted with the Government in favour of the second reading were Lord Salisbury, Lord Bath, Lord Devon, Lord Carnarvon, and Lord Nelson. The only Bishop who supported the Government was Bishop Thirlwall of St. David's. Thirteen English and three Irish Bishops voted on the other side. The numbers were announced—for the Government, 179; against it, 146. The second reading was thus carried by a majority of 33.

Diary.

“LAMBETH, *Sunday, 20th June 1869.*—A most fatiguing and exciting week ended yesterday. I spoke on Monday night. . . .

¹ *Hansard*, June 14, 1869, pp. 1707-1715.

I have been abundantly praised and abused for the part I have taken. No doubt it has greatly helped the result—the Bill being read a second time. I earnestly trust we shall be able to carry the amendments of which we have spoken. I myself, with the Archbishop of York, Duke of Richmond, Lord Stanhope, and many others, abstained from voting, though urging the Peers to allow the Bill to float into the House. . . . Certainly the Bishops have borne a conspicuous part in the fray. The scene of the reception of the Bishop of Peterbro's speech was the most remarkable thing I ever witnessed. . . . Grant, Lord, that in the anxious time which now lies before us our minds may be kept calm, and that in the excitement of this great contest to amend the Bill we may all of us be found faithful to our conscientious convictions and relying on Thee."

No sooner was the second reading carried than negotiations began with reference to amendments to be proposed in Committee. The Archbishop, and those who acted with him, had, as the foregoing letters show, declared, as the very ground on which they sanctioned the second reading of the Bill, their intention to obtain, if possible, large modifications in Mr. Gladstone's proposed terms of disendowment. To this end amendment after amendment was, with varying success, directed. To recount them in detail would be impossible, and indeed there were few which involved any question of large or general principle. One distinct issue was, however, raised—Should the principle of 'concurrent endowment' be admitted in any form into the measure? Opinions in the House of Lords were widely divided, Lord Cairns, the Duke of Marlborough, and other strenuous opponents of the Bill resisting with uncompromising firmness any amendment which involved the principle of endowing Roman Catholic clergy with a portion of the funds alienated from the Church of Ireland. On the other hand, Lord Salisbury, Lord Carnarvon, Lord Russell, Lord Stanhope, and many others, gave their votes in favour of the 'concurrent' principle.

Some of the amendments involving it were carried ; some were lost : and the question was not ultimately decided until the third reading of the Bill. The Archbishop had all his life been in favour of such a recognition of the Roman Catholic priesthood by the State. In the Oxford Union, more than thirty years before, he had proposed a resolution to the effect "That a legislative provision for the Roman Catholic priesthood in Ireland would be a most beneficial measure." Twenty years later, when Dean of Carlisle, he had contributed to the *Edinburgh Review* a vigorous article in favour of the Government grant to Maynooth, and in spite of the remonstrances of some of his more Protestant friends, who expressed a "desire to throw a veil over that melancholy feature in the debate—the Archbishop's advocacy of concurrent endowment"—he now seized the opportunity of speaking strongly on the same side as before.

The Duke of Cleveland moved an amendment to permit the application of some of the alienated funds to the purchase of glebe lands and houses of residence for the Roman Catholic clergy, and the Archbishop thus explained his own position in the matter :—

"My reason for supporting the amendment of the noble Duke is this : that ever since I was able to think on politics I have conceived that the policy indicated was the only policy likely to bring peace to Ireland. I have in my humble way supported that policy in matters of education. I have supported it in the matter of the Queen's Colleges. I have always thought it right and fair that the Maynooth grant should be made. I have thought that though we were not bound in Ireland, as in Canada, by an actual treaty, yet, being brought into close relations with our Roman Catholic brethren, we could not deny them that small meed of justice which the Maynooth grant gave them without treating them as if they were our slaves. . . . Therefore, when I am called upon to say whether I still maintain the policy which I have always supported, I am constrained to

adhere to the opinions which I have entertained for the last twenty years. . . . It appears to me to be something not very real to say that there is a great principle at stake in an amendment which proposes to put the Roman Catholic priests into comfortable dwellings. Being forced to pronounce an opinion between what seems to me the sham scheme proposed by the Government as to the disposal of the surplus, and the real scheme of the noble Duke, I shall record my vote in favour of the latter.”¹

It was this speech and the vote subsequently given in favour of its principle which drew from Lord Shaftesbury, a few nights later, one of his most vehement denunciations. “The vote has produced,” he said, “more anger, grief, and consternation in the country than any vote that is recorded in the whole history of Parliament (!). . . . It has very seriously injured your Lordships’ position. . . . It has still more seriously injured the position of the Bishops, and the safety of the Established Church.”²

For although the particular proposal supported in the Archbishop’s speech was rejected by a large majority, the principle was admitted in a subsequent amendment which Lord Stanhope succeeded in carrying on the third reading of the Bill, notwithstanding the declaration of the Government that it was impossible to accept the clause.

The amendments multiplied from day to day. Every portion of the Bill afforded subject for controversy, and the discussion in Committee occupied seven long nights. On its conclusion the Archbishop wrote as follows :—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Her Majesty the Queen.

“LAMBETH PALACE, July 8, 1869.

“The Archbishop of Canterbury presents his humble duty to your Majesty, and ventures, in continuation of his former com-

¹ *Hansard*, July 2, 1869, p. 1078.

² *Ibid.* July 30, 1869, p. 282.

munication, to state to your Majesty what he considers to be the present position of affairs with reference to the Irish Church.

"The Bill, as amended in the House of Lords, gives up the political ascendancy which has been so much complained of, and sacrifices between £400,000 and £500,000 a year of the present income of the Church. It reserves only the moderate endowment of about £125,000 a year. This is the practical effect of the three great amendments carried in the House of Lords.

"Otherwise stated, the matter stands thus. While Mr. Gladstone calculates the whole sum properly capable of being raised from the funds of the Irish Church at £16,000,000, the Bill as amended reserves £3,000,000 only for the Church's permanent endowment. Now, with less than £100,000 a year, thus saved (or £3,000,000 of capital), it will be very difficult indeed, if in any way possible, to keep the Church, scattered through the whole of Ireland, in any condition of efficiency. The friends of the Irish Church feel that they cannot allow that Church to be despoiled beyond the point thus indicated, and that it would be wiser to take the chance of another year of agitation, however undesirable, than yield beyond this point. The interests of present incumbents are of course secured, but such a sum as is here stated is indispensable to the efficiency of the Church when the present incumbents shall have passed away. If the House of Commons would agree with the Lords in allowing to the Church such a moderate portion of its own resources as seems indispensable, all reasonable opponents of the Irish Church, as it now is, ought to be satisfied, and that Church might go on henceforward, like the Church in Canada, or any other moderately endowed Colonial Church. The Archbishop of Canterbury trusts that your Majesty will excuse his thus stating what seems to him the indispensable condition of a satisfactory settlement of this difficult question."

Her Majesty the Queen to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"WINDSOR CASTLE, July 11, 1869.

"The Queen thanks the Archbishop very much for his letter. She is very sensible of the prudence and at the same time the anxiety for the welfare of the Irish Establishment which the Archbishop has manifested in his conduct throughout the debates, and she will be very glad if the amendments which have been

adopted at his suggestion lead to the settlement of the question ; but to effect this, concessions, the Queen believes, will still have to be made on *both* sides. The Queen must say that she cannot view without alarm the possible consequences of another year of agitation on the Irish Church, and she would ask the Archbishop seriously to consider, in case the concessions to which the Government may agree should not go so far as he may himself wish, whether the postponement of the settlement for another year would not be likely to result in worse rather than in better terms for the Church. The Queen trusts, therefore, that the Archbishop will himself consider, and, as far as he can, endeavour to induce others to consider, any concessions that may be offered by the House of Commons, in the most conciliatory spirit. . . .”

On July 12 the amended Bill was read a third time in the House of Lords, and sent back to the Commons. It may be well to summarise briefly the changes it had undergone. Sixty-two amendments in all had been carried in the House of Lords. But many of these were unimportant or merely consequential, and the principal changes actually made in the measure may be grouped roughly under five heads :—

1. The principle of concurrent endowment had been introduced, though in a form far less definite than its supporters, including the Archbishop, would have desired to see. Lord Stanhope had carried a clause by a narrow majority, authorising the use of some portion of the surplus to provide houses of residence for Roman Catholic priests and Presbyterian ministers, as well as for the clergy of the Disestablished Church.
2. Better terms of commutation had been rendered possible both for beneficed clergy and for assistant-curates. And the conditions on which existing houses and glebes might be retained were much more favourable.

3. A lump sum of half a million was to be given to the Church in lieu of Mr. Gladstone's much-abused suggestion that she should retain all 'private endowments' given subsequent to the year 1660.
4. The Bill, as introduced, had enacted specifically what was to be done with the surplus funds. It was admitted that many years must elapse before this surplus would become available, and Lord Cairns had now carried an amendment leaving the disposal of these funds to the future wisdom of Parliament.
5. The actual date at which Disestablishment should take effect had been postponed for four months, from January 1 to May 1, 1871.

Whether for better or worse, the measure had obviously been altered in a very drastic manner, and it was declared to be certain that, whatever Mr. Gladstone's own wishes, he could not carry his followers with him were he to receive the amendments favourably. The Ministerialists described the Bill as "so mutilated as to be practically useless,"¹ and the vociferous Radical cheers which greeted Mr. Gladstone when he rose on July 15 to move "that the Lords' amendments be considered" were significant of the temper of the House. Already the advanced wing of the party were openly rejoicing at what they deemed the infatuation of the Peers in subjecting themselves to the necessity of either a humiliating surrender or a stern, and perhaps fatal, defeat on a fresh appeal to the country.

¹ *Punch's* cartoon will be remembered, which pictures the Archbishop as a gypsy nurse giving back a changeling instead of the child intrusted to her :—

"*Nurse Canterbury.*—Which we've took the greatest care of 'im, mem, and 'ope you'll think 'im grow'd.

"*Mrs. Prime Minister.*—That is not *my* che-ild ! Not in the least like it."

Mr. Gladstone's speech was quite uncompromising. He made no attempt to soften down the differences, he even accentuated their gravity, as he recounted the amendments one by one, and called upon the House of Commons to reject the preposterous proposals of men who had shown themselves to be as ignorant of the feeling of the country as though they were "living in a balloon." He insisted upon the excision of each and every clause which involved, however indirectly, the principle of 'concurrent endowment'; he declined to sanction the postponement of the date of Disestablishment; and he declined to leave the disposal of the anticipated surplus to the wisdom of a future Parliament. He consented, however, to allow a reconsideration of the commutation terms, and he went further than some of his supporters liked in agreeing to give the 'lump half-million' in lieu of the 'private endowments' which had been so much discussed.

His unyielding attitude and words delighted the Radicals and intensely exasperated the House of Lords, but when the two nights of hot debate were ended he was found to have practically given way rather more than had been at first supposed, and many firm friends of the House of Lords thought that that assembly would act wisely in accepting without more ado the half-compromise which he had offered.

But the leaders of the Upper House thought otherwise. The Peers met on July 20, and after a debate of quite unusual warmth adhered by a majority of 74 to the first and most important of their rejected amendments—the authorisation given in the preamble to the principle of concurrent endowment. On this declaration of war Lord Granville immediately adjourned the House, to take counsel with his colleagues, and it seemed

no longer possible that a decisive collision could be averted.

For some days the Archbishop had been striving to mediate between the contending parties as represented by Lord Cairns and Mr. Gladstone, and he was in almost hourly communication with the Queen. As his Diary shows, he did not even yet give up hope ; but negotiation was now difficult in the extreme, and he had unfortunately, on the following day, to keep a long-standing engagement to open the new chapel at Cranleigh School, some thirty miles from London. Among the peculiar difficulties which increasingly beset the public life of a Bishop, and still more of an Archbishop, is the necessity of making engagements long before for duties which cannot be deputed to another, while it is quite uncertain what may be the possible demands upon him in the House of Lords or elsewhere. Never, even in Archbishop Tait's life, did a more marked example of this occur than now. In the midst of an intricate negotiation of the supremest importance to the country he had to leave London in order to preach and speak at the opening of a school chapel, or else to cause infinite inconvenience by his unexpected absence. The present Archbishop of Canterbury, who, as head-master of Wellington and a governor of Cranleigh School, was present on the occasion, has described "the quiet and easy vigour with which Archbishop Tait spoke at the public luncheon on that day, appealing playfully across the hall to a head-master present, as he contrasted the fresh and perfect appointments of Cranleigh with the dingier 'Big School' of the old Foundation, which they both knew well. Weightier topics were of course treated in the sermon he had preached, and in the luncheon speech itself ; but all was in this spirit, disengaged and free from preoccupation, as if nothing else had for the

time to be thought of. No one at the table probably imagined what a weight of anxious responsibility was resting at that moment on his shoulders."

But the negotiations were all the while in progress, and, as shown by the Diary quoted below, he arranged for their continuance on the following day, when he returned to London at an early hour. The result became known to the world that night. When the House of Lords met at five o'clock the battle was over. The Government agreed to give way upon the clause enacting the precise disposal of the surplus, and to accord terms distinctly more favourable than before to the commuting clergy of the Disestablished Church. They were also willing—if pressed to do so—to concur in the suggested postponement of the date of Disestablishment. The Peers, on the other hand, gave way upon the principle of 'concurrent endowment,' which, though advocated by the Archbishop and others, had never obtained the support of Lord Cairns himself. The mutual compliments and congratulations which marked the speeches of Lord Granville and Lord Cairns were in curious contrast to the fire which the same speakers had interchanged two days before. The House and the country were taken completely by surprise, and Lord Cairns had to ask the indulgence of his friends for the responsibility he had incurred in privately agreeing on their behalf to the new terms offered. Beyond question it was to the Queen and the Archbishop that the successful compromise was mainly due; and, so far as the Archbishop is concerned, a sufficient picture of what took place is presented by the following extract from his journal :—

"HERNE BAY, *Sunday, 25th July*.—Last Sunday we spent at Hatfield. On our return to town on Monday morning (July 19th) I found a messenger from Windsor waiting for me with a

further letter from the Queen about the Irish Church. It is a great blessing that the Queen takes such a vivid interest in the welfare of her people, and is (*e.g.*) so earnest to ward off a collision between the two Houses of Parliament. I wrote an immediate short answer, of which I had no time to make a copy. I told Lord Salisbury (and next morning we had a further conversation on the subject). At one o'clock on Monday (19th) I met the Dean of Windsor by appointment, fresh from the Queen. Afterwards had an interview with Gladstone. I took his terms to Cairns and Salisbury at Cairns's room in House of Lords, at four o'clock.¹ Found Grey, Carnarvon, and Salisbury with Stanhope and Cairns there. . . . The 'ultimatum' (as it was then supposed) of Cairns was intrusted to me, and I arranged where I should see him next day. The University Tests Bill and the Bishops' Resignation Bill kept me late at the House. Tuesday (20th) was given up to negotiations between Cairns and Gladstone, which all proved ineffectual, and an apparently hopeless quarrel . . . broke out on Tuesday evening. I went home in despair, thinking the House of Lords had lost all it had gained during the last six weeks. Very low in spirits, I reported to the Queen through a letter to the Dean of Windsor between twelve and one that night. . . . Early next morning I wrote to Gladstone and Lord Granville, and telegraphed to the Dean of Windsor, offering my services still, if it were possible, to restore peace. Went to Cranleigh to meet Catharine and the party from Mr. Cubitt's at the opening of the Middle Class School Chapel erected by the munificence of Mr. Henry Peek. Great luncheon and speeches. Duke of Northumberland, Lord George Hamilton, Brodrick, Buxton, etc. Every one full of the political quarrel and the hopeless dead-lock between the Houses. On reaching Mr. Cubitt's found a Treasury messenger with letters from Gladstone and Granville, sent off after the meeting of the Cabinet. This looked well. Mr. Cubitt kindly gave a concert in our honour, which nearly finished me. Lovely place. Beautiful pictures. Next morning (Thursday, 22d) off early by train. Reached Ecclesiastical Commission before eleven. Had, by Treasury messenger last night, appointed Bishops of Peterborough and Derry, with Archbishop of Dublin, to see me. Received another

¹ The Archbishop preserved some curious memoranda of these interviews, in the shape of some half-dozen scraps of note-paper containing the autograph terms of the leaders of the two negotiating parties.

letter from Gladstone, expressing his readiness to concede further. . . . Urged the Irish Bishops to accede to terms. Found them too much afraid of their Irish friends. Peterborough tried in vain to induce them. Was obliged to go to Ritual Commission at 1 o'clock, and during my stay there (at our last meeting for the season) negotiated with Stanhope, Bishop of Gloucester, Lords Harrowby and Beauchamp in favour of Gladstone's new terms. Bishop of Peterborough went to Cairns, and secured a meeting for me at 4. Found him with Salisbury just going to meet Granville. Read him Gladstone's fresh overture. By 5 o'clock all was settled. See *Hansard* for account of the debate and the mutual felicitations. Spoke. Catharine and Craufurd in House. Home between 11 and 12, very thankful that the matter was arranged, but depressed as to the condition of Trench and the Irish Church generally. We have made the best terms we could, and, thanks to the Queen, a collision between the Houses has been averted ; but a great occasion has been poorly used, and the Irish Church has been greatly injured, without any benefit to the Roman Catholics. Friday the 24th, we all went to Addington to join the children. Yesterday (Saturday) I came down here to stay with Mr. Geary, and preached. Preached today. It is refreshing to come to this quiet sea-place, where the Irish Church is scarcely thought of. Yesterday wrote to Trench and the Irish Primate letters which they might show.

"O Lord, grant that quiet time may now be given me to look after my own soul and the souls of my diocese. May the removal of the pressure of this great political contest be blessed to me ! Keep me near Thee in prayer and quiet Christian living, through Jesus Christ."

It has seemed right to tell in some detail the events of these busy months, the first months of his Primacy, as the whole episode is one eminently characteristic of the Archbishop's practical statesmanship, and of the persistent energy and hopefulness with which he maintained the course likely, as he believed, to be the most beneficial in the end.

As soon as the controversy was over he received warm expressions of thanks from the Queen, from Mr. Gladstone,

and from the Irish Bishops. He was assured of Her Majesty's recognition of his "combined firmness and moderation throughout this unhappy crisis, from the second reading to the end." Archbishop Trench, as the representative of the Irish Bishops, wrote as follows: "All Irish Churchmen, if they are not vulgarly thankless, will keep a most grateful memory of all that you did, and sought to do, in aid of our Establishment while it was passing through the crisis of its fate, and I, with those others who were the immediate witnesses of your efforts, will keep the most grateful record of them all."

CHAPTER XX.

THE ARCHBISHOP'S DIOCESAN WORK—HIS GREAT ILL-
NESS—CONSECRATION OF BISHOP TEMPLE—THE
REVISERS' COMMUNION.

1869-1870.

IN the letters of congratulation which the Archbishop received on his appointment, there was a chorus of thankfulness at the thought of the comparative leisure, or, at least, the relaxation of arduous work, which he was now to enjoy. How vain such hopes had hitherto been the last chapter has made clear. It may safely be said that, in the summer of 1869, no man, in or out of Parliament, bore a heavier burden of varied and absorbing work than the Archbishop of Canterbury. And as soon as the session was closed and his London labours ended, new duties of another sort began. There is necessarily much that is monotonous in the record of episcopal work, and to produce a mere transcript from its records would be unduly to tax the patience of all ordinary readers. But a few extracts from the Archbishop's Diaries seem essential here. At the very time when most public men in England are able to indulge in a complete holiday, it devolves not unfrequently upon a Bishop or Archbishop who has been as severely taxed as any of them, to find or make opportunities for the discharge of some of his most essential duties. The following extracts will show how Archbishop Tait spent the first of his autumnal 'holidays':—

Diary.

"ADDINGTON, *Sunday, 28th August* 1869.—The past week has been one of work. On Monday I went carefully through as much as I could overtake of Addington parish with Mr. Benham,¹ making acquaintance with my poorer neighbours. It reminded me of the old days of parish visiting at Baldon in 1836-7-8. The people much of the same calibre and stage of education as I knew them in Oxfordshire as a curate. Discouraging: when we think how much has been done for education in the last thirty years."

"On Tuesday [Aug. 23] started early for Dover. . . . Glorious fresh air and broiling sun. 91st Highlanders assembled under arms on the heights (under Bertie Gordon, an old school-fellow, not seen for forty years). Splendid pipers. Mrs. Gordon presented new colours in a capital speech. I addressed the men. Many of them Campbells from Argyllshire. . . . Great gathering at dinner.

"*Wednesday, 24th.*—Preached at St. Mary's. Lunched with clergy and choirs. Drove to see deserted and neglected parish of —. Truly, agricultural are as great as town difficulties. Church in bad condition. School shut up. Interview with excellent farmer churchwarden, much to be remembered. . . . Another great dinner-party at night. . . .

"*Thursday, 25th.*—Preached at re-opening of St. Margaret's at Clyffe. . . . Tent luncheon. Back in time to visit the old British and Roman Church in Dover Castle.

"*Friday, 26th.*—Consecration of West Langdon Church. Visited churches and parsonages at Sutton, and Whitfield, and Great Mongeham. Reached Walmer Castle about 6.30. Found Gladstone lying in blankets on the ramparts eating his dinner, looking still very ill. . . . He joined us at night, full of intelligence. His fierce vigour all the better of being a little tempered. . . . Much interesting conversation about the state of the Church and morality in Wales. Also about leading ecclesiastics. . . . I gather that he will certainly nominate Temple for a Bishopric. I slept in Mr. Pitt's bed, and sat to shave in his chair. . . .

"*Saturday, 27th.*—Back to Addington, preaching on the way at St. James's, Croydon. I am feeling rather tired out. . . . It is impossible at these times, when I get quietly into the country, not to look back on long-forgotten sins. How wretched would

¹ The Rev. W. Benham was Vicar of Addington from 1867 to 1873.

the thought of them be were it not for the all-sufficient atonement of the Lord Jesus. I have been preaching to-day: '*The good Shepherd giveth His life for the sheep.*' . . . Lord, may the thought of the falls of the past cause me to cling nearer to Him who alone can keep me upright in the time to come!"

Four or five weeks of this unremitting diocesan work were followed by a large ordination, when he records his special thankfulness that "we have now room enough to gather all the candidates as inmates of our own house for the week."

Late in September he left with Mrs. Tait for Scotland.

"CARLISLE, 1 Oct. 1869.—How strange is life—and death. We arrived here yesterday. I had been led to believe that the Bishop of Carlisle was better. To-day we drove over to Rose Castle to see him. George Waldegrave came to us in the hall, and said that I was just in time to offer up the commendatory prayer. . . . He was quite unconscious. . . . After I left him I took the little boy into the chapel and prayed with him, and gave him my blessing. It is just 33 years since I watched over Sam Waldegrave in his rooms in Balliol, when, as a freshman, he was dangerously ill,¹ and here was I brought back, as Archbishop of Canterbury, to say the commendatory prayer when his useful life was ended. . . . The house was full of reminiscences. The furniture in the rooms unchanged. All unchanged without in the woods and gardens, and the strange changes within. O Lord, make us ready.

"As we returned we stopped at the loved grave, and lingered over the thoughts of each of the five. How is that hallowed spot fixed for ever in our memory!"

"THE COTTAGE, BLAIRLOGIE,² Sunday, 10 Oct. 1869.—Another Sunday here after four years' absence. The place improved, but the hills the same. How tender are the recollections: of Mary—of my visits here from Balliol in old days—of our first visit after our marriage, now twenty-six years ago—of darling little Catty here as a baby in 1846—of Catty's and May's last visit here, when they were so joyous and loving, . . . then, after our awful bereavement, dear Lucy and Edie living in the cottage under the hill, while we moved about. . . . The place is indeed full of a

¹ See vol. i. page 58.

² His brothers' country home, near Stirling.

thousand hallowed recollections. My dear brothers are wearing away—very old. We are all passing, and how varied and strange the reflections forced upon us by return to old scenes! Lord hallow them, through Jesus Christ.

“BISHOPTHORPE, YORK, *Sunday, 24 Oct.* 1869.—A kind welcome here, . . . but when we leave home for rest, I think it would be wiser not to go on a tour of visits. I trust for some quiet time at Stonehouse and Addington in the coming winter. Otherwise I must go into retreat. . . .

“Last week, in Edinburgh, I visited the old house at Park Place, and wandered through the nurseries, full of thoughts of old days, old sins, old joys, old griefs.”

“LAMBETH, *October 28th.*—Consecrated Bishop Moberly for Salisbury. As I said to him, this reversed the order of nature. In 1830, as a timid undergraduate, I was placed under him as tutor. In 1835, I succeeded him as tutor of Balliol. He introduced me on that memorable morning when I breakfasted with him, in the rooms that afterwards became mine, to Archbishop Manning as an eminent bachelor and safe friend.”

“ADDINGTON, *31 Oct.* 1869.—Great difficulties respecting Temple’s appointment. O Lord, overrule all to the good of Thy Church, for Christ’s sake. Amen.”

“*Wednesday, 3 Nov.*—To town for interview with Gladstone, Granville, Lord Chancellor, and Cardwell, respecting increase of the Episcopate. Archbishop of York met me and the other bishops named above at Downing Street. After full discussion it was intimated that the Ministry could not propose the foundation of the new Bishoprics, and it was resolved to have recourse to the Act of Henry VIII. for appointment of suffragans where required.”

“*Thursday.*—Attended Ecclesiastical Commission. The letters each day have been beyond number, and many remain unanswered, to be taken on my coming Confirmation tour, next week. . . .”

“*Tuesday, 9th Nov.*—Very interesting day. Confirmation in Faversham Church. Visited splendid national and middle-class schools. Visited the church and old ‘religious house’ at Davington. A large party at Syndale in evening.

“*Wednesday.*—Off at 7.30 to Dover. Breakfasted there, and wrote letters till train for Hythe, and so to Saltwood. Very unpleasant singing in my ears, making me very uncomfortable.

. . . Confirmation at Smeeth. Visited the new schools. Got on to Tonbridge Wells, in a snowy night, in time for a large dinner-party of clergy at Mr. Hoare's. Great Confirmation on 11th at Tonbridge Wells, and a second equally large at Tonbridge. Drove to Tonbridge after a huge luncheon party, and in the dark drove fifteen miles from Tonbridge to Mr. Talbot's at Falconhurst, where most kindly received. Met many people at dinner. Confirmed next day at Penshurst. Great luncheon of clergy and others. . . . Returned in dark. Another dinner-party. . . . On Saturday 13th confirmed at Edenbridge. Great luncheon of many clergy and others. Confirmed in afternoon at Westerham. Drove to Colonel Ward's lovely place, Squerries. After tea started for a drive in the dark over the hills. Got to Addington at 9.15. Very thankful to have got through a heavy week so well, notwithstanding the perpetual singing in my ears."

"ADDINGTON, *Sunday, Nov. 14.*—A happy, quiet Sunday. . . . Visited Mrs. Davis in her sickness, and Mrs. Whalley sorrowing for her little twin babies; prayed with both. This quiet village is a great delight. I trust I shall be kept here in mind of old pastoral duties. . . . The multitude of letters is frightful. On the tour I could not write many, but one night at Mr. Talbot's managed to send off thirty-six. There is a terrible pile waiting. . . ."

And then, for nine long months, there is no further entry in the Diary, and when the handwriting reappears it is changed and shaken.

Ten years later he recounted what had followed upon the busy weeks described above.

"Hitherto," he writes, "the change to Canterbury had certainly brought no relaxation of work. The Confirmations were pressing. All seemed to go on prosperously, and my strength to be equal to my duties. But the bow, it would seem, had been overstrung. . . . [On Monday, November 15th] I had been to a diocesan meeting at Ashford, and in the evening spoke for one of the Missionary Societies. Next morning I had to hurry to London for the Ecclesiastical Commission, and I think for a meeting of the Charterhouse, then down to the Isle of Thanet by the evening train. Next day was spent quietly at home [at Stonehouse], but correspondence was accumulating, and I believe ninety letters

had to be superintended and despatched by that post. I was very tired in the evening, but next morning [November 18] I rose fresh as usual. I remember going into my wife's room and finding her reading the Bible with the children. I warned them not to work their mother too hard. I remember also looking out of the window on the bright frosty morning, and anticipating a day of comparative rest. I returned to my dressing-room, but I had not finished dressing when I fell prostrate and senseless on the floor."

It was a convulsive seizure of the most alarming kind, and on the recurrence of a second attack a few hours later, it was thought right to telegraph for Craufurd Tait from Oxford. There was partial paralysis of face and arm and side,¹ and Mrs. Tait wrote that evening to his sister that they were "simply waiting for the end." But though the attacks recurred at intervals, he lost no ground, and, three days later, Archdeacon Parry, who was acting as domestic chaplain, wrote as follows to a friend:—

"Gull and Haden were here yesterday. I begin to be a little hopeful. Last night he felt faint again, and wished for the Holy Communion, so Mrs. Tait woke Craufurd and me at half-past three, and we had the solemn service in the stillness of the night. No more convulsions, but he is drowsy, and the numbness on the left side is, I believe, the worst symptom. But, as I say, I hope—for *life*, that is ;—for I see no prospect, in any case, of further work."

The medical reports, however, of the next ten days gave little hope of recovery, and an official intimation in the *Lancet*, more than a fortnight after the original seizure, emphatically warned his friends against adopting an over-sanguine view.

"The bulletins which have been issued daily respecting the health of the Archbishop of Canterbury have given rise to apprehensions which we regret it is not in our power to allay. Without

¹ His left arm long remained quite helpless, nor did it ever again, during the thirteen years of his life, regain its full vigour.

entering into details which it would be inexpedient to publish, we have authority to state that the condition of His Grace must be considered, immediately or prospectively, a very serious one."

Gradually, however, to the surprise of almost every one, his vigorous constitution reasserted itself, and it became apparent that the causes of the paralysis had been of a functional and not an organic nature, and that the mischief was not therefore of a permanent character. Before the year closed all immediate danger was declared to be over, although it was certain that recovery must be tedious at the best, and that no work whatever could be undertaken for many months to come.

With characteristic calmness he had, from his first recovery of consciousness, given grave thoughts to the exigencies of his public work. In view of the possibility, or even probability, as it then appeared, of a further return of the paralytic seizure, which might perhaps incapacitate him from either performing his duties or formally resigning his office, he expressed a decided wish to sign some paper of resignation which could be placed in the hands of the Queen or her advisers, to take effect in the event of any such recurrence.

"I cannot but feel," he wrote (or rather dictated), "that the necessity for such a measure may be apparent to others, whilst I myself may be unconscious of it, and it is against this contingency that I wish to provide."

With this view, his intimate friend and chaplain, Mr. Knollys, had a confidential interview with the Dean of Windsor, the result of which is recounted in the following letter:—

The Dean of Windsor to Mrs. Tait.

"THE DEANERY, WINDSOR, Dec. 17, 1869.

"DEAR MRS. TAIT,—Mr. Knollys will tell you the substance of the conversation which I had with him. It was briefly that the

Archbishop had better not sign any document to be placed at once in the Queen or Ministers' hands. But if it would be a relief to him to sign anything to take effect in case of a return of his illness, that he should place it in the hands of his own family, who could place it in the Ministers' hands if the medical advisers of the Archbishop thought it necessary that he should get a suffragan immediately, stating,—at the same time that he was applying for one,—that this step was quite independent of any that he might feel himself hereafter obliged to take, as to *himself*, which must depend upon the extent of his recovery after experience. All this I have detailed to the Queen, and Her Majesty expressly desires me to tell you that she thinks my advice most judicious, and that she quite concurs in it. My own opinion is that there is a general impression that the Archbishop is getting better, and that the public mind is quite content to await his progress towards recovery, and that it is not at all necessary for him to come thus early to any determination as to what he will do. Meanwhile the suffragan will take off the immediate pressure of routine business.

"Your anxieties must have been overwhelming, and only equalled by the deep and general sympathy of the Church, in the full sense of that word, with its chief.

"Pray write if I can be of use.—Yours truly,

"G. WELLESLEY."

In accordance with this advice Mrs. Tait retained in her hands for many months a document to which effect might at any time have been given had the necessity occurred.

His correspondence had at once been taken in hand by Archdeacon Parry, whose letter to a neighbouring rural dean sufficiently explains itself:—

Archdeacon Parry to the Rev. Canon Bateman, Rural Dean.

"STONEHOUSE, ST. PETER'S, THANET, Nov. 24, 1869.

"MY DEAR SIR,—The Archbishop of Canterbury, in the midst of his serious illness, has much upon his mind the subject of some Ruridecanal Conferences, for which arrangements were on the point of being made when His Grace was suddenly taken ill. Among the number your Deanery was included.

"I have therefore to ask you, on behalf of the Archbishop, and at his most earnest request, that you will be so good as to invite the Clergy of your Deanery as soon as possible to a meeting (the arrangements for which must be entirely left to your own discretion), not now for discussion, but for prayer."

"'Prayer,' the Archbishop says, 'is better than discussion.' 'And tell them,' he added, 'that I have come to the determination what to pray for myself. I have desired to live especially that I might carry out the organisation of lay-helpers in the Church; but it is possible that my life might be a hindrance and not a help to the work. So now I quite determine to pray that God would give me and His Church that which will be best. This prayer cannot be wrong, as God knows what is best. If I were to pray for my life, I might pray for what would be a hindrance and not a help to the work of His Church.'

"I have only to add to these affecting words, that the Archbishop's mind has, from the first, been perfectly clear, and that his whole trust is placed in the merits and mediation of the Lord, who died for sinners.—Believe me, my dear Sir, yours very truly,

"EDWARD PARRY,

"Archdeacon of Canterbury."

Mrs. Tait preserved an immense pile of letters which had reached her in the course of these anxious weeks of waiting and watching. They bear evidence to the value which was attached to the Archbishop's life, even by those with whom he was far from being in full agreement.

A single letter, written by one who occupies a high and responsible position, will serve as a sample of many that might be quoted:—

"For many years the good Archbishop has been in our household a symbol of reverence and affection, such as we accord to few living men. If anything could have increased my own personal loyalty, it would have been the wise, generous, large-hearted letter—so worthy of a Christian ruler and father—which appears in the *Times* of to-day. May God grant that his invaluable life may still be spared to the Church and Nation! He is a tower of strength to all that is least sectional and most Catholic in our divided Christian body. There is no man living whose

example and authority go so far to remind us of the importance of the great truths in which we all agree, and the comparative unimportance of those which give rise to contention. We can indeed ill spare the active energies, much less the life, of such a chief pastor."

On January 15, 1870, the Archbishop was able to return to Addington, but he was not yet allowed to take any part whatever either in diocesan or other work. It was accordingly an immense satisfaction to him that he was able—in the manner he had himself recommended for some years past, as both feasible and desirable—to obtain the assistance of a suffragan Bishop to relieve him permanently of a large portion of his diocesan duties and responsibilities.

More than one allusion will be found above to the revival of the office of Bishop-Suffragan, and it may be appropriate here to summarise briefly the steps by which this change, so important in its consequences to the Church of England, was carried into practical effect. For many years it had been felt how inadequate were the numbers of the Episcopate to the needs of an increasing population, and attention had frequently been called to the existence of an unrepealed Act of Henry VIII.,¹ which provided specifically for the appointment of suffragans to assist the Diocesan Bishops in work which would otherwise be beyond their strength. Some 250 years had passed since this Act had last been put into operation, but it still stood upon the Statute-Book. In a charge to the Archdeaonry of London, in April 1856,² in face of the difficulties which had arisen from Bishop Blomfield's illness, Archdeacon Hale had publicly appealed for the resuscitation of the

¹ 26 Henry VIII. cap. 15. The first who advocated the use of this Act was Dr. Newman, in a pamphlet published in 1835, and reprinted in *Via Media*, vol. ii.

² *The Office of Suffragan in the Church of England*. Rivingtons, 1856.

long-disused system, and the question subsequently came forward for discussion both in Parliament and in Convocation.¹

Foremost among those who advocated this reform was Archdeacon Wordsworth, who, immediately on his nomination to the See of Lincoln, brought the question within the range of practical politics, by applying (on November 25, 1868) for the appointment of a suffragan to assist him in the work of his overgrown diocese. To this request the Government did not at first think it possible to accede, and they were fortified in their opposition by the fact that Bishops Wilberforce and Selwyn, who had previously been in favour of the revival of the long-forgotten Act, now deprecated it, on the ground that it was totally inadequate to meet the present difficulties, which demanded a far more drastic measure of reform. But before another year had passed it became apparent that a positive step of some kind must be taken, and the Archbishop, as will be remembered, had an important interview with Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues on the subject a few days before his illness began. He had never himself shared the apprehensions of those who regarded the proposed change as inopportune and dangerous; and he had, as Bishop of London, supported the plan in a vigorous and important speech when it came before the House of Lords in connection with a Bill of Lord Lyttelton's in 1867. The plan proposed and rejected in 1867 was not precisely that which came afterwards into operation, but it was closely analogous to it. A few extracts from that speech will explain his subsequent readiness to take advantage of the relief afforded, and will exonerate him from the charge, brought against him in 1870, that he was forced by illness

¹ For these repeated discussions see *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1866, pp. 330, 348, 599; 1867, p. 959; 1868, pp. 1076, 1584, 1595; 1869, pp. 27, 77, 182, 201.

into this mode of solving a difficulty which would have been better met by resignation :—

“ . . . I never heard, my Lords, of any course which was not open to some objections, and our practical duty in ordinary concerns is to follow the course to which the objections are fewest. . . . Taking things, then, as they are, and looking to our possibilities as Parliament has limited them, this appears to me to be the best feasible course for meeting present difficulties. . . . My Lords, it is a fact that Bishops, like other men, grow old and infirm, and incapable of fully performing all the duties of their office. Some of these duties, nay, the highest, those requiring counsel rather than bodily activity, they may be perfectly able to perform in advanced old age. But certain other of their duties must, to a great degree, fall into arrear as old age advances. What is your practical proposal to remedy this evil? I will take even the case of that venerable Bishop who presides over the diocese of Exeter—that elastic intellect, not borne down by the weight of ninety years—that keen perception, not dimmed though bodily sight has failed. Not one of your Lordships is a shrewder observer of what is going on in the Church and in the world. . . . You may say he should resign. But surely in such a case mere resignation would lose to the diocese a wise counsellor and ruler, one who holds the hearts of his clergy and his laity, and who, by proper relief, may do admirable work among them for years to come. Such relief, enough, and yet not too much, it is now proposed to offer. . . . But, my Lords, it is not only that Bishops must grow old. They are also liable, like other men, even in the vigour of life, to temporary illnesses. What happens when one of the judges is taken ill on circuit? Why, unless I am misinformed, a commission is issued to one of the sergeants to take his place. It is not thought necessary to search the country for some retired Indian or Colonial judge to do the work. . . . But, moreover, there are other cases in which the amount of work to be performed renders its due performance a sheer impossibility. Not to instance again the See of London, to which I have already referred, let us look at the See of Canterbury. Can any one doubt that the momentous and every year increasing duties of the Primate of all England must interfere with the full discharge of his diocesan duties in the county of Kent? The present venerated occupant of that See we rejoice to see in remarkable bodily

vigour ; but even he, I think, will allow that the performance of duties requiring his presence in some four or five different places at the same time presents difficulties, and difficulties which are every year likely to increase. The endless and accumulating correspondence involved in regulating the affairs of the Church at home, the appeals of every sort from decisions made by those over whom he is called to preside, and that authority of reference which he exercises, and must exercise, over the multiplying churches of the colonies : how is a man to be confirming down in Kentish villages and attending to all these things in London ? . . . The Pope does not personally perform the diocesan work of his Bishopric of Rome, but acts through the Cardinal Vicar. In the Chapel of St. Denis, over which the Archbishop of Paris presides, I find, unless I am mistaken, no fewer than five bishops *in partibus*. Now the noble Earl, agreeing with the fathers of the Reformation who passed the Act of Henry VIII., repudiates the fiction of Bishops *in partibus infidelium*, and yet—feeling that the very fact of that fiction having been so long acted on in the unreformed Church represents a real want—desires, in the spirit of those Fathers of the Reformation, to meet the difficulty. . . . His proposal is alike plain, practical, constitutional, and inexpensive, and I earnestly commend it to your Lordships' consideration."

The advice did not at the time prevail. The clause was rejected, and the whole Bill was subsequently withdrawn ; but when, two years later, the Government came to see the necessity of allowing the appointment of suffragans, Archbishop Tait had been able to prove by experience the truth of his own words about the labours of the primacy, and he decided at once to ask that a suffragan might be appointed to help him. Accordingly Archdeacon Parry, who had been his pupil at Rugby, and in later years his domestic chaplain and intimate friend, was consecrated Bishop of Dover in Lambeth Palace Chapel on March 25, 1870, and at once took upon his shoulders the main burden of the diocesan work.

Every year which has passed since then has made it

increasingly certain that no Archbishop of Canterbury, however vigorous and robust, will hereafter be able to do without this assistance. The new life of the Anglican Church, organised both at home and beyond the seas in a hundred ways unknown to our fathers, has multiplied ten-fold the labours of every Bishop in England. But it is on Lambeth that the main pressure has undoubtedly converged,¹ and the contents of the Archbishop's daily letter-baskets and engagement-book have now attained an importance and a volume of which few, probably, among the host of ready critics have any adequate conception. It may be difficult to calculate how much of the eager importunity with which work is multiplied for the Archbishop of Canterbury is due to the energy and capacity of Archbishop Tait's fourteen years' primacy; but in any case it is certain that the strain is now increasing every year, and that the problem is one for which it will be imperatively necessary before long to find some further solution.

One other subject demands a short notice here. During the early weeks of the Archbishop's illness the whole country had been strangely agitated by Mr. Gladstone's nomination of Dr. Temple to the See of Exeter. Reference to the *Times* for the months of November and December 1869 shows that there was hardly a day on which angry letters of protest were not written, or angry meetings held. Before the storm had reached its height the Archbishop was laid aside, unconscious of the strife of tongues: but naturally it was to him that men turned in the earlier stage of the conflict.

In September 1869, three Sees were vacant, and the vacancy of two others seemed imminent. Mr. Gladstone

¹ For Archbishop Longley's testimony to this fact, even in his day, see *Chronicle of Convocation*, May 4, 1866, p. 255.

had for some weeks been in correspondence with the Archbishop on the subject. The final letter was as follows :—

*The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone to the
Archbishop of Canterbury.*

“*Secret.*”

“HAWARDEN, Oct. 2, 1869.

“MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—You have been very kind in supplying me with information and advice, and I take the earliest opportunity of giving your Grace what will be before the world in a few days.

“The arrangements are—

1. Bishop of Oxford to Winchester.
2. Lord A. Hervey to Bath and Wells.
3. Dr. Temple to Exeter.
4. Mr. Mackarness to Oxford.

“I am persuaded that these appointments will not meet with your Grace’s disapproval, though I am not so sanguine as to believe that *one* of the three new names will pass without some noise.—I remain, your Grace’s most obedient and faithful

“W. E. GLADSTONE.”

The apprehended noise was soon heard. A committee was immediately formed to promote resistance to the appointment, both in the diocese and elsewhere, mainly on the ground that the Bishop-designate lay under the actual censure of Convocation, which had, in 1864, condemned in unsparing terms the volume of which Dr. Temple’s Essay formed a part.¹ It will be remembered that in that censure Bishop Tait had borne no part, strongly as he disapproved of much that the book contained. It was not he who had suggested Dr. Temple’s name to Mr. Gladstone for nomination to a Bishopric, but he had known Dr. Temple too long and too intimately to be unaware of his great qualifications for such a post.

Sixteen years later the time was to come when these

¹ See vol. i. chapter xii.

qualifications should be attested almost with one voice by the whole Church of England. But it had not come yet, and letters flowed in upon the Archbishop by every post, beseeching him to interfere and to protect the Church. One friend, in high and responsible position, wrote :—

“Matters are hourly growing more serious. . . . The diocese of Exeter is fast approaching the boiling point. Meetings are being held, organisations set on foot, and every preparation made for resistance. Can your Grace in any way interpose so as to prevent Gladstone pushing matters to an extremity? He has chosen the worst diocese in England to practise on. . . . Is it too late?”

Dean Hook, who had been advocating the resignation of the aged Bishop Gilbert of Chichester, wrote to the Archbishop to say that he had now joined “in entreating the Bishop, since Dr. Temple’s nomination, not to resign his See until Mr. Gladstone has been driven out of office.”

The Dean and Chapter of Exeter were urged not to obey the *congé d’élire*. “The agitation in the diocese,” wrote the Dean, “becomes stronger every day, and from all parts of the country I have letters about the sword of the Lord and of Gideon, exhorting us to go to prison, and promising us visits there.”

Lord Shaftesbury allied himself once again with Dr. Pusey and his friends in protesting vehemently against the appointment. Dr. Pusey’s letters grew fiercer and fiercer as week followed week, and Dr. Temple, whom he accused of having “participated in the ruin of countless souls,” still remained silent, while the preparations went forward for his consecration in due course. One name, at least, of unimpeachable orthodoxy, and already of high repute, although its future prominence was scarcely guessed, was to be found upon the other side. Dr. Benson, Head-

master of Wellington, wrote to the *Times* (October 22, 1869) a long and weighty letter in defence of Dr. Temple. This letter, to which attention was called in a leading article, checked for a moment the vehemence of the onslaught. But only for a moment.

Mr. Gladstone, to whom the Archbishop had forwarded some of the letters he received, replied, in returning them : "The movement against Dr. Temple is, like a peculiar cheer we sometimes hear in the House of Commons, vehement but thin." It thickened, however, before the day of consecration came, and no step was left untried to avert from the Church of England what was described as "a blow from which she may rally for a time, but after which she can never be the same," and again, "as perhaps the greatest sin with respect to fidelity to revealed truth in which the Church of England has been involved since the Reformation."¹

The election was hotly opposed in the Chapter of Exeter, but it was carried on a division by thirteen votes against seven. An unusual crowd assembled in Bow Church on Wednesday, December 8, to hear lawyers in wig and gown raise formal argument against the authoritative confirmation of the election. Again, as in Dr. Hampden's case twenty-one years before, the objection was overruled ; and at last, on Tuesday, December 21, the consecration took place in Westminster Abbey after a fresh renewal of protests, Episcopal, Presbyteral, and lay.

In these latter stages of the controversy the Archbishop had been unable to take part, but on the very day that he was stricken down he sent the following reply to a Ruridecanal remonstrance against the threatened "scandal" :—

¹ See letter from Bishop Trower in *Times*, 27 December 1866.

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. J. J. Saint,
Rural Dean.*

“STONEHOUSE, S. PETER'S, THANET,
Nov. 19, 1869.

“REV. AND DEAR SIR,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of a memorial, signed by yourself and other clergy in the deanery of South Malling, on the subject of the nomination of Dr. Temple to the See of Exeter.

“I shall not enter into the general question of the safeguards against any attempt being made in our mixed constitution of Church and State to force upon the Church a man who, from heretical opinions, or from some other unfaithfulness, is unfitted to hold high office in the Church of Christ. I shall only remark in passing that I feel thankful that these safeguards, as it appears to me, are very effectual. The practical question is—Has such an unworthy and unfit person been nominated to the See of Exeter?

“Now, personally, I have known Dr. Temple for thirty years, and greatly reverence his many noble qualities. I endeavour, however, to approach the question as in God's sight, greatly fearing, on the one side, any injury to the faith of the Church; on the other, any injustice to the individual; and, with a solemn feeling of responsibility, the following is my judgment :—

“I do not consider that any blame can fairly attach to Dr. Temple for having originally contributed to the *Essays and Reviews*. I believe that the persons requested so to contribute had no knowledge of the nature of the work. When the book appeared I greatly regret that Dr. Temple did not take the earliest opportunity of dissociating his name from all connection with the volume. But I am bound to give full consideration to the following facts :—That the preface to the volume contains a general disclaimer on the part of all the writers of responsibility for anything but his own work; that in the protest against the book which was signed by the Bishops, there was no allusion to any part of Dr. Temple's essay; that Dr. Temple did take an early opportunity of publishing a volume of his sermons, in which he sets forth his own belief and system of religious teaching. I am bound to pronounce that, in my judgment, Dr. Temple is not responsible for the opinions of the other essayists, and that his own works contain no statements contrary to the faith of the

Church of England. He is an earnest and intelligent believer in all the great doctrines set forth in our Prayer-book and Articles. Knowing from other sources his earnest, self-denying, energetic Christian life, I do not wonder that so many of the attached members of the Church of England have continued to show their unwavering confidence in his Christian excellence by intrusting him with a greater number of pupils than has ever been gathered together in Rugby School, and that this feeling of public confidence has led the Prime Minister to judge that he might fairly be raised to the Episcopate. On the other hand, I feel very strongly that Dr. Temple, if he believes that he cannot do so now, is bound, at least when he enters on the duties of the See of Exeter, to take steps as soon as possible for allaying the anxiety which has been called forth, and for convincing all that are committed to him in the Lord that the book called *Essays and Reviews* is far indeed from being an exponent of his sentiments and of his religious teaching.—I remain, Rev. and dear Sir, yours very truly,

“A. C. CANTUAR.”

This letter did little more than repeat, in altered circumstances, what he had said in Convocation five years before, when the volume of *Essays and Reviews* was under discussion. Bishop Temple's striking sermon in Exeter Cathedral on the day of his enthronement¹ must have gone far to reassure at once his more faint-hearted friends, and to justify to the world the Archbishop's confidence and hope.

In the early weeks of 1870, he regained—as has been already said—sufficient strength to enable him to return to Addington. At first he was quite unfit for work of any kind, but with the spring his powers came gradually back to him, and in the early summer he found himself able to resume his correspondence, and occasionally to attend such meetings as involved no heavy labour or excitement. To his great disappointment he was peremptorily forbidden to attend the summer session of Convocation.

¹ Wednesday, December 29, 1869.

But the doctors were inexorable, and he was compelled to remain at Addington, the Bishop of London presiding in his stead over two somewhat memorable debates.

The medical opinion was perhaps influenced by the very eagerness of the Archbishop to be present. For the occasion was one which would have called forth all his earnestness. Large principles were at stake, the very principles for which he had been contending for more than thirty years.

The Committee or 'Company' appointed by Convocation to revise the Authorised Version of the New Testament had met for the first time on Wednesday, June 22. The inaugural meeting was preceded by a celebration of the Holy Communion in Henry VII. Chapel in Westminster Abbey, at which were present almost all the revisers, including several Scotch Presbyterians and English Nonconformists, among them Dr. Vance Smith, a Unitarian. When Convocation met a fortnight afterwards attention was at once called to what was termed the "scandal" of this Communion, and the Bishops of Gloucester and Salisbury, as members of the Revision Committee, explained in detail what had actually taken place. They pointed out that whatever official responsibility attached to the so-called "invitation" belonged to the Dean of Westminster alone. His circular had gone forth to the revisers in the following form :—

"DEANERY, WESTMINSTER,

June 18, 1870.

"It having been suggested that the Company of Revisers of the Authorised Version of the New Testament might be desirous of partaking together of the Holy Communion before entering on their work, the Dean of Westminster has consented to administer the Holy Communion to such of the Company as shall be disposed to attend, in the Chapel of Henry VII. in Westminster Abbey, at 11.30 A.M., on Wednesday, June 22."

The Bishop of Salisbury, High Churchman as he was, expressed as emphatically as the Bishop of Gloucester his personal satisfaction at what had taken place :—

“ With respect to those of us who participated in the Holy Communion on the occasion referred to . . . I do not understand that a person who receives the Holy Communion is concerned to inquire who are the persons around him at the time. I look on that as a matter which belongs to the Ordinary ; but when I came to be informed afterwards who they were who were kneeling with me around the grave of Edward VI., I confess I felt thankful that they had grace to come.”¹

This opinion was supported, though with some reserve, by most of the Bishops present at the debate. But it was soon evident that this was not the view taken by High Churchmen throughout England. The storm which had begun with mutterings soon thundered forth in earnest. Angry letters and memorials flowed in upon the Archbishop from every side, and the Church newspapers gave expression, and some of them encouragement, to what was termed the “ general consternation and dismay.”

In recounting the first debate in Convocation, the *Guardian's* heading was “ Revision of Holy Scripture : The Comprehensiveness of the Established Church.”² But very different terms came speedily to be employed. The English Church Union, the prime mover in the agitation, described the act as “ a dishonour to our Lord and Saviour of the gravest and most emphatic

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, July 5, 1870, p. 431.

² It is worth recording, too, what were the first comments of the *Guardian* upon the Westminster Communion. The following is from its leading article of June 29, 1870 :—“ The whole of those who accepted the invitation of Convocation met, with one exception, in Henry VII. Chapel, and received the Holy Communion together at the hands of the Dean. This is certainly a very practical and striking answer to the difficulties which have been conjured up as to the practicability of co-operation in such a religious cause between Churchmen and Nonconformists. It is, we trust, a happy augury of the spirit in which their joint undertaking will be prosecuted.”

character"; and such expressions as a "gross profanation of the Sacrament," "an outrage on Revealed Religion," "a horrible sacrilege," and the like, recur again and again in the 'Memorials.'

Even these expressions were exceeded in violence by some of the Church newspapers, in which appeared such comments as the following:—"The Communion of June 22d may be taken as a deliberate embodiment of insult and defiance to the whole of Catholic Christendom, and to the ancient faith of the Christian world." Or again, "The rumoured blasphemy has proved too true, . . . a dignitary of the Church has cast pearls before swine, and given that which is most holy to the dogs. There can be no possible defence for such an act of desecration as the administration of the Holy Communion to Presbyterians, Baptists, and Unitarians."

It was scarcely to be expected that, in the face of utterances such as these, Mr. Vance Smith, whose admission to Holy Communion formed the principal grievance of the memorialists, should keep silence.

At an early stage in the controversy he wrote a letter to the *Times*,¹ in which he retorted warmly upon his assailants; and, with regard to his own action, said:—

"I did not go to [the service] under any false pretence of professing one thing while believing another, and of course I retained my own ideas of the nature of the rite. No one asked me what these were, or requested me to disavow them. . . . Nor did I join in reciting the Nicene Creed. I heard it recited by others, and I was perfectly willing to tolerate their avowal of their Christian Faith in their own form of words—as they, I supposed, were willing to tolerate my silence."

The whole tone of this letter, written of course under extreme provocation, was calculated rather to fan than to

¹ July 18, 1870.

allay the flame. A few days later he wrote to the Archbishop at greater length and in quieter language to explain his original position :—

Rev. G. Vance Smith to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“ August 4, 1870.

“MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,— . . . [Some of your memorialists] express their grief and astonishment at the admission [to the recent service] of ‘teachers of various sects, and more especially of one understood to be a denier of the Divinity of our Lord.’

“I have reason to know that the latter words refer to myself. I am anxious therefore to assure your Grace that they do not, in any general and unqualified sense, correctly apply to me. I do not deny ‘the Divinity of our Lord’ as I find it to be declared in the New Testament. On the contrary, I believe it, and maintain it. It is, indeed, probable that I differ from the memorialists, as they from me, on several important points, but for this I am in no way answerable to them, nor does the fact that I so differ from them give them any right to describe me to your Grace in the unqualified terms which they use, as ‘a denier of the Divinity of our Lord.’ . . .

“I attended the Communion Service, on the occasion referred to, in no other spirit than that of a reverent and earnest desire to join in the sacred rite of our religion, one which I considered specially becoming in the particular circumstances under which it was celebrated. I was, of course, aware that there are expressions in the legally prescribed form of administration in which I could not join; but I felt, nevertheless, that, while merely a silent spectator in regard to such expressions, I could yet join in other essential parts of the Service—that I could, in particular, join in partaking of the elements ‘in remembrance,’ and in confession of our common Christian Head. . . .

“ . . . On the very peculiar occasion which has given origin to this controversy, I believed it to be in the highest degree becoming that those who were entering upon so important a work as the revision of the English Version of the New Testament should unite in making a common Christian confession—even though we might not all be able equally to accept the form of words employed (which no one had any power to alter) or

put exactly the same construction upon every act or expression of the Service. Hence I readily availed myself of the notice sent to me, as to other members of the revision company, and I was glad to join with my fellow-workers in so open and devout a profession of the Christian name.— . . . I remain, with much respect, your Grace's very obedient servant,

"G. VANCE SMITH,

"Minister of St. Saviour Gate Chapel, York."

Before any of Mr. Vance Smith's letters appeared, the Archbishop had replied briefly and in general terms to a memorial from the President of the English Church Union, the Hon. C. L. Wood, who, while "hailing with satisfaction the desire of Presbyterians, Wesleyans, and others to take part in the services of the Church," had deprecated as "a dishonour to our Lord and Saviour" the concession of "the sacred privilege of Church communion to persons who deny the Church's characteristic doctrines." To this letter the Archbishop had replied :—

" . . . I do not hesitate to say that I agree with you in thinking it a cause for thankfulness that so many persons of whom this could scarcely be expected should be ready to join in the solemn doctrinal statements contained in our Communion Service ; while I scarcely think it would have been right to repel, as you seem to desire, any individual who was willing so to join, and who had been thought fit to take part in the great religious work of revising the present version of the Holy Scriptures.

"I myself trust that fellowship in this work may draw together many who have hitherto been kept asunder, and I shall not be surprised if Unitarians, as well as others, are greatly benefited by being associated in this attempt faithfully to interpret the written Word of God, undertaken, as the service to which you allude shows it to be, in a spirit of earnest prayer for Divine guidance."

But since this letter was written the circumstances had greatly changed. Fanned by Mr. Vance Smith's utterances on the one hand, and by the widely circulated memorials and protests on the other, the excitement had

reached white heat, and it was no longer Mr. Vance Smith's communion alone that was objected to. The occasion was precisely one on which the Archbishop would have wished to make his voice heard in debate in favour of the wider sympathy and toleration of which he had been the advocate ever since his Oxford days. But this was now impossible, and he was compelled to the course he always liked less—a further reply by letter to his innumerable memorialists.

Canon Carter had transmitted to him a Memorial, signed by 1529 clergymen of the Church of England, in the following terms:—

“We, the undersigned priests and deacons of the Church of England, desire to express to your Grace, as our chief pastor, our grief and astonishment at the admission, in Westminster Abbey, to the Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, of teachers of various sects, openly separate from our communion, and more especially of one understood to be a denier of the Divinity of our Lord.

“We also beg respectfully to state our belief, that the Church expressly guards against such a cause of offence by the rubric which requires that ‘there shall none be admitted to the Holy Communion until such time as he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed.’”

To this Memorial the Archbishop made immediate and careful reply:—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. T. T. Carter.

“ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
August 11th, 1870.

“MY DEAR MR. CARTER,—As the Memorial which you have presented to me on the subject of the recent celebration of the Lord's Supper in Henry VII. Chapel in Westminster Abbey is only one of several Memorials, of which I have received intimation as likely to be presented to me, all called forth by the same event, I shall, I hope, be allowed to give one answer to them all; though by adopting this course, I may not exactly distinguish

between the different aspects of feeling or principle which characterise each separate document. I would first remark that the communication which I addressed to the Hon. C. L. Wood on the 2d of July last, in answer to letters and an address received from him, might have almost sufficed as expressing my views on the subject now brought before me. Some circumstances have, however, occurred since those communications were made by me, which perhaps require that, while I refer you to what I then stated, I should add a few words in further exposition of my sentiments.

“Let me say, before going further, that I am sure the Memorialists will agree with me that the motives of all who took part in this solemn celebration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Death and Passion before commencing the great work to which they had been called in the revision of our translation of the Holy Scriptures are entitled to be respected by all Christian men ; and it is deeply to be deplored that, in the heat of controversy, harsh words should have been published, and uncharitable accusations made, against good men, who had no desire but to follow the Lord's command in asking for a blessing on their labours by uniting in this holy rite. I think, moreover, that it is a melancholy thing, whosoever may be to blame for it, that the religious faith of an individual communicant should have become the subject of newspaper controversy, not conducted throughout in the Christian spirit which thinks and speaks no evil.

“But to confine ourselves strictly to the Memorials : They are, I doubt not, all dictated by an anxious desire to maintain the purity of the faith of our Church and to uphold the sacredness of Christ's ordinances ; and I feel sure that in this view of their intention they will command the respectful consideration of all who took part in the celebration to which reference is made. But when we come to the detailed grounds of complaint, there is obviously room for great diversity of opinion.

“The one complaint common to all the Memorials is, as I understand it, that a Unitarian minister, thought worthy of taking part in the work of revising our translation of the Sacred Scriptures, and presenting himself with the other Revisers, was not repelled from the Holy Table. I am aware it is urged that he was invited to participate ; but of the accuracy of this allegation I find no proof.

“What alone is clear is this, that notice was given to him as

to all the other Revisers ; and, had he not previously refused to act, such notice would, I presume, have been sent to the eminent Roman Catholic divine who was also requested to serve on the Committee.¹ It had been resolved that there should be an administration of the Holy Communion for the Revisers. Notice was given to all, and it was left to each to decide as before God whether he could conscientiously draw near to the Holy Table and join in the Service by which our Lord and Master is adored. Nothing could be more proper in itself than a celebration of the Holy Communion on such an occasion, and deprecating, as I most solemnly do, any lowering of our Church's standard, I consider there was no course open but to leave to each individual the decision of the question whether he could conscientiously present himself or no.

“The gentleman to whose presence such frequent allusion has been made has written to me explaining his motives in attending, and giving some account of his religious sentiments and opinions : he repudiates in strong terms views which have been attributed to him, and, I am bound to say, he uses these remarkable words : ‘I do not deny the Divinity of our Lord, as I find it declared in the New Testament. On the contrary, I believe it and maintain it.’ This proves what I have long known, that it is extremely difficult to estimate the exact degree of divergence from our Church's doctrine that makes a man attach himself to the Unitarian body, which includes within it every shade of opinion from the highest Semi-Arianism to Socinianism. I confess, however, that I do not understand the frame of mind that would lead a teacher of religion to protest against the Nicene Creed, and at the same time to join in a solemn service of which that Creed and its doctrines form from the beginning to the end so prominent a part. Neither can I understand any one feeling it right to invite to our Communion Service a teacher of the Unitarian body which so protests.

“My belief is that in this case no such personal invitation was given ; and I think that the gentleman in question, feeling he could not accept the great doctrines which the Service most distinctly proclaims, committed an error in being present, though I doubt not he came with the best possible motives, and I trust may receive a blessing on his desire to consecrate his work, as a translator, by a solemn act of worship.

¹ Dr. Newman.

"In all that I have thus written it will be seen that I have thrown the responsibility as to attendance on the individual conscience of those who join in the Holy Communion, agreeing as I do in this with the Ritual Commissioners, who in their recent Report have appended to the directions respecting the Administration of the Lord's Supper the following note:—'The foregoing directions are not to be held to authorise the refusal of the Holy Communion to those who humbly and devoutly desire to partake thereof.'

"It will then naturally be asked whether there is no safeguard provided whereby the clergy are authorised to repel unworthy participants. I consider that the rubrics of our Prayer-Book which precede the Communion Service are explicit as to certain classes of persons who ought to be repelled. Error of religious opinion, it is urged, is not one of the disqualifications specified in these rubrics. Do I, therefore, rule that an avowed infidel ought to be received, even if it be known to the officiating minister that he only comes to scoff? I answer, that in any case where a minister is in doubt the Church points to the propriety of his consulting his Bishop, and, if the case is such as to require him to act at once, he must forthwith inform his Bishop, with whom, and not with the officiating minister, the ultimate responsibility of deciding the case must rest.

"Thus I hold that the sacredness of the Holy Ordinance is sufficiently guarded by a responsibility vested not in each individual priest, but, as becomes so weighty a matter, in the highest officers of the Church.

"It will be seen on the whole that while I am in no way insensible to the natural and honest anxiety of those who have memorialised me, I believe they have no ground for alarm lest the solemnity of the Church's ordinances should be lowered.

"But some of the memorialists are indignant at the admission of any Dissenters, however orthodox, to the Holy Communion in our Church. I confess that I have no sympathy with such objections. I consider that the interpretation which these memorialists put upon the rubric to which they appeal, at the end of the Communion Service, is quite untenable.

"As at present advised, I believe this rubric to apply solely to our own people, and not to those members of foreign or dissenting bodies who occasionally conform. All who have studied the history of our Church, and especially of the reign of Queen Anne, when this question was earnestly debated, must know how it has

been contended that the Church of England places no bar against occasional conformity.

"While I hail any approaches that are made to us by the ancient Churches of the East and by the great Lutheran and Reformed Churches of the continent of Europe, and while I lament that Roman Catholics, by the fault of their leaders, are becoming further removed from us at a time when all the rest of Christendom is drawing closer together, I rejoice very heartily that so many of our countrymen at home, usually separated from us, have been able devoutly to join with us in this holy rite, as the inauguration of the solemn work they have in hand. I hope that we may see in this Holy Communion an omen of a time not far distant, when our unhappy divisions may disappear, and, as we serve one Saviour, and profess to believe one Gospel, we may all unite more closely in the discharge of the great duties which our Lord has laid on us of preparing the world for His second coming.—Believe me to be, yours very sincerely,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

Together with this formal reply the Archbishop wrote privately to Canon Carter as follows :—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. T. T. Carter.

"ADDINGTON, *August 11, 1870.*

"MY DEAR MR. CARTER,—Though you are good enough to say in your letter of to-day that I need not write an answer to the Memorial which you have sent to me on the subject of the recent celebration of the Holy Communion in Henry VII. Chapel, I feel that I could not receive so important a document without answering it. I trust that my answer may do something to allay the anxious feeling of which you speak in your letter. You may be sure that I am not likely to regard with indifference an expression of thought and feeling such as that contained in the Memorial.—Believe me to be, yours most truly,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

Protests and remonstrances continued to come in for many weeks after these letters had been written. The Bishop of Capetown, who was in England at the time,

wrote a characteristic letter on behalf of his South African Province, and several Colonial Bishops added their names to one or other of the Memorials. But the all-absorbing topic of the Franco-German War left scant attention available for ecclesiastical strife, and, as no practical action was then possible, the sounds of battle died by degrees away,

They were, however, renewed with vigour in the following spring, when, in the February Sessions of Convocation, held during the Archbishop's absence in Italy, the whole subject was re-debated at full length both in the Upper and the Lower House. The view taken by some of the Bishops in the previous year had undergone a change during the controversies of the autumn, and Bishop Wilberforce, although himself the author of the original resolution which invited "the co-operation of any, eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong," now moved and carried¹ a resolution in the following terms :—

"That it is the judgment of this House that no person who denies the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ ought to be invited to join either Company to which is committed the revision of the Authorised Version of Holy Scripture, and that any such person now on either Company should cease to act therewith."

Bishop Thirlwall of St. David's, who was not only the Official Chairman but the foremost member of the Old Testament Revision Company, considered this resolution so mischievous and so likely to throw discredit on the scholarly honesty of the Revisers' work that he next day resigned his place upon the Revision Company.²

¹ By 10 votes to 4, seventeen Bishops being present. See *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1871, pp. 3-28, 72-90.

² *Ibid.* Feb. 16, 1871, pp. 146, 147.

In the Lower House, Dean Stanley denounced, with characteristic warmth and eloquence, what he described as the "scandalous inconsistency and vacillation" involved in the Bishops' change of front,¹ and besought the House, by withholding any indorsement of the Bishops' resolution, to "do its utmost to save from shame the Episcopate of England."² After prolonged and heated discussion, the Lower House, in lieu of indorsing the Bishops' words, passed the following resolution by a majority of three only :—

"That this House expresses its deep regret at the offence caused by the receiving of the Holy Communion in Westminster Abbey by a member of one of the Companies of Revision who denies, and has publicly declared his rejection of, the Creed commonly called the Nicene; and after this expression of the feeling of the House, the House is persuaded there will be no repetition of such cause of offence."³

So ended a controversy which caused immense excitement at the time. The Archbishop's action in the matter was criticised, of course, with severity and even bitterness by those who regard the admission of a Nonconformist to Communion as being in itself a sin. But his letter to Canon Carter conveyed no casual or immature opinion upon an isolated case. Questions as to the occasional admission to Communion of those who were not members of the Church of England came before him again and again during his public life, and he never wavered in the advice he gave. Scotch Presbyterians, some of them his contemporaries or even his seniors, used to ask his counsel as to receiving the Holy Communion in the Church of England. To those who, at whatever age, desired to become actual members of the Church of England, he

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, p. 170, etc.

² *Ibid.* Feb. 17, p. 266.

³ *Ibid.* p. 276.

always urged the blessing if not the absolute duty of Confirmation, and his three sisters were all of them confirmed by him, on his advice, when well advanced in life. But he repeatedly declined to authorise or justify the refusal of Communion to Scotch Presbyterians resident for a time in England, and he was always ready to defend his opinions both on theological and historical grounds. It was therefore a keen disappointment, to which he often adverted in after life, that he was absent from Convocation on the two successive occasions when the subject was thus officially before the House. Although the actual discussion turned mainly upon the quite exceptional question of the admission of a Unitarian, it was not thus limited in Canon Carter's Memorial, and the debate repeatedly took the wider range which would have given him an opportunity of speaking his mind more fully upon a subject the interest of which is neither local, temporary, nor insignificant.

Another controversy was now agitating the minds of many devout English Churchmen. On December 8, 1869, the great Vatican Council had assembled at Rome. More than 900 Bishops from every part of the habitable world were summoned by Pope Pius IX. to his Council. No less than 767 attended. It was known from the first that the main object of the Council was the promulgation of a decree in favour of what is shortly termed the 'Infallibility of the Pope.'

Ought the Church of England, or rather the world-wide Anglican Communion, to take any official notice of the gathering of such a Council? Her Bishops had received no summons, and yet the Council claimed to be called Œcumenical. Ought they to protest against such an exclusion, and formally to clear themselves of all complicity in any decrees the Council might pronounce?

Not a few of those well competent to judge were of opinion that the Church's self-respect imperatively demanded such a course, and that she was bound in honour to give a moral support to the minority within the Council walls, who, while emphatically asserting their loyalty to the Roman See and to all her dogmas as hitherto received, desired now to raise a protest against this unauthorised and arbitrary addition to the 'Catholic' Faith.

The opinion that such a step was necessary gained ground rapidly among English High Churchmen, and took shape, when the Council had been six months in session, in the following letter from Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln :—

The Bishop of Lincoln to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“RISEHOLME, LINCOLN, 8th June 1870.

“MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—About ten days ago I received a private letter from Rome, stating that some of the Bishops in the Roman Council who apprehend evil results from the promulgation of the dogma of the personal Infallibility of the Bishop of Rome would be very thankful for the moral support of the Anglican Episcopate.

“I sent the letter to the Bishop of Ely,¹ and it has been communicated too to the Bishop of Winchester.²

“From the latter I have received a letter expressing a desire on his part, and of some other Bishops, that the Bishop of Ely and myself should prepare a protest against the decrees of the Roman Council as not having the true character of an Œcumenical Synod.

“I venture to submit to your Grace's consideration, whether the present crisis is not very favourable for the action of the Anglican Episcopate in two respects—(1) With regard to the English public, and (2) in the face of Christendom, as holding a definite and distinct position in maintaining the true Faith and ancient Discipline of the Church ; and next, as taking a defensive position against Roman error and usurpation.

¹ Bishop Harold Browne.

² Bishop Wilberforce.

"The Bishop of Ely has prepared an English protest for the English public, and has sent me a copy of it. In compliance with the request received from the Bishop of Winchester, writing in his own name and that of other Bishops, I have drawn up another manifesto, for the Christian public generally, and I beg leave to submit herein a copy of it to your Grace for your consideration; and I have also sent a copy to the Bishop of Winchester and Bishop of Ely.

"I suppose that the dogma of the Papal Infallibility will be promulgated to the world on the 29th of this month, St. Peter's Day; and I cannot but think that it would be a great and glorious opportunity for the Anglican Episcopate to put forth on the same day a Manifesto to the world in opposition to Romish Error, and in defence of Catholic Truth.—I have the honour to be, my Lord Archbishop, your Grace's dutiful servant,
"C. LINCOLN."

The 'Manifesto' enclosed by the Bishop was a long and eloquent Latin document, intended to be signed by the Bishops of England, Scotland, and Ireland, expressing the Church's indignant protest against the title of 'Œcumenical,' as applied to a Council to which her own Bishops had not been summoned; her abhorrence of the proposed dogma of Papal Infallibility, which must result in untold misery and wrong; and her solemn appeal to a Free General Council when such should be assembled.¹

¹ Quoniam Ecclesiæ Christianæ ea est lex et forma, a Christo Ipso constituta, ut quæcunque unam Ejus partem tangunt cæteras quoque sollicitent . . . ea quæ nunc in Concilio Vaticano tractantur ad nos pertinere arbitramur. Videmus nonnulla decreta ab illâ Synodo jam esse promulgata, et eò rem devenisse ut . . . Concilium Vaticanum . . . Sedi Romanæ Divinam Infallibilitatis prærogativam sit adscripturum . . . Quanti inde piorum luctus sint erupturi . . . quanta dissidia sint oritura, quanti incredulorum triumphus Ecclesiæ Christianæ insultantium . . . quanti furores in eam debacchantium . . . vobis, fratres dilecti, vix potest esse obscurum. . . .

Ad Concilium Generale omnes Episcopi debent appellari. Verum enimvero Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Episcopos ad Concilium non vocavit Pius Pontifex . . . Quoniam igitur jure Concilium Romanum dici potest Œcumenicum? . . . Ad Concilium verè Œcumenicum nos provocamus. Libera sint voces. Libera suffragia . . . Ii qui Pontifici Romano Divinos honores decernunt eum in altius fastigium extollunt ut casu ruat graviore. Nos autem, etc.

This was not the Archbishop's first intimation of the proposal. He had had several conversations on the subject with those who were anxious for the issue of a protest, but he had not been able to satisfy himself that it was, at this stage at least, desirable. It seemed to him impossible to support the would-be dissentients on this particular point, within the Council, without making light by the very act of the other fundamental differences between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, and thus alienating—and, as he thought, reasonably alienating—the sympathy of Protestants both in England and abroad.

He replied accordingly as follows:—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of Lincoln.

“STONEHOUSE, ST. PETER'S, THANET,
June 10th, 1870.

“MY DEAR BISHOP,—I am much obliged to you for letting me see the Manifesto which you have drawn up against the Roman Council. It is with regret that I find myself compelled in this matter to take a different view from one whose opinion naturally commands such high respect. But I cannot, as at present advised, persuade myself that it is desirable for the Episcopate of the English Church to put forward any manifesto. The statements of our Church, as set forth in our Articles and Formularies, respecting the claims of the Church of Rome, are so full and explicit that, as it seems to me, they require neither explanation nor addition. The more dignified, sober, and wise policy for us to adopt, as I think, is to let Rome take her own course. The Church of England has not been addressed by the Pope or the so-called Œcumenical Council on the subject, and I cannot say that I see any necessity for our putting forth an address. I fully expect that if the supporters of the claim to Infallibility are left alone, they will do their own cause infinite damage and us a great deal of good.

“As to any request from Bishops of the Roman Church that we should move for their sake, I have no desire to give to any

party in that Church 'the moral support' of which you speak. I am sure the English nation does not expect any declaration or action from us other than can be secured by a steadfast adherence in our practice and teaching to our old principles. Neither do I think that the great body of Christians elsewhere is expecting us to move.—Believe me to be, my dear Bishop, yours very sincerely,
A. C. CANTUAR."

Without the Primate's signature the Protest could scarcely go forth, and his refusal to indorse it was a keen disappointment to its promoters. Bishop Wilberforce and others made unavailing efforts to induce him to take a different view. He was quite decided that, for the present at least, such a protest as had been suggested would do more harm than good, and would, in England at least, alienate more sympathy than it could possibly attract. Emphasis was given to this fear by a joint meeting of English Churchmen and Roman Catholics, held in London on June 20, at which resolutions were carried urging the "paramount importance of reunion" round the Roman Primacy, provided only the dogma of Papal Infallibility could be repudiated or escaped. When this was reported it created a stir quite disproportionate to the real importance of the meeting, but amply justifying the fears to which the Archbishop had given expression.

When Convocation met in July the subject was, notwithstanding his enforced absence, discussed at full length, and the Upper House, by a majority of 7 to 2,¹ decided on the appointment of a Committee to consider and report upon the question. As Convocation did not meet again that year, the Committee could present no report until the following February, when the Archbishop was abroad.

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1870, pp. 509-512, 600-622. The two dissentients were the Bishops of London and Gloucester. Bishop Wilberforce declined to vote.

Meanwhile the Infallibility Decree had been solemnly promulgated at Rome, and before the Council broke up (in December) the anticipated opposition which had been threatened within its walls to the famous dogma had practically died away, although its mutterings were audible both in Germany and France.

What followed, so far as the Church of England is concerned, may be conveniently recounted here. In January 1871, the Archbishop, who was then at Mentone, received, in a private letter from Bishop Selwyn of Lichfield, a copy of the proposed report. The conditions were now altogether different from what they had been when the Bishop of Lincoln's Protest was drawn up six months before. The Council, decree and all, was a *fait accompli*, and there was no longer any risk that the English Bishops should seem to be endeavouring to take part from outside in the deliberations of an irregular and alien assembly. Hence the following letter, which explains itself:—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of London.

“MENTONE, FRANCE,

January 17, 1871.

“MY DEAR BISHOP OF LONDON,—I have received from the Bishop of Lichfield a paper put forth by a Committee of both Houses of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury on the subject of what is called the Vatican Council, and I now send to you my views thereon, requesting you to read this letter publicly in Convocation.

“I retain the opinion I have already expressed that such a protest as we are advised to issue is unnecessary and inappropriate. I feel as much as any man can the difficulties to which many earnest-minded Roman Catholics are exposed by the unauthorised additions which have of late been made to their Creed, separating them more widely from the faith of the Apostles and the Primitive Fathers; and if a declaration from the living

Church of England could in any way help them more effectually than that everlasting protest by which in our Prayer-Book and Articles, generation after generation, we point to Holy Scripture as the standard of Truth, I should rejoice to take part in such a work. But I believe the best way of meeting the natural anxieties of such members of the Church of Rome as are disturbed by recent events, is to use all the means in our power to make them acquainted with our formularies and the works of our standard divines, and to encourage them above all things to study God's Word written.

"Should, however, the two Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury resolve on adopting such a protest, I should of course throw no difficulties in their way, premising that I could not give my approval to any definition of the Church of Christ less comprehensive than that set forth in the 19th of the Thirty-Nine Articles, or to any description of the position of our own Church which, in condescension to the weakness of our Roman Catholic brethren, might widen the differences which separate us from the great Protestant communities which maintain the same Evangelical faith with ourselves. Moreover, the Committee have given no definition of that free General Council to which they state the Church of England appeals, and it is therefore necessary to remark that I could not be a party to any imaginary appeal to the decision of a gathering of all the Bishops who at present exist throughout the world, in which assembly, if it could be brought together, I fear the voices of the supporters of the pure Apostolical Faith of Christ would scarcely be listened to amid the numbers of those who by their very position are pledged to the maintenance of error.—Believe me to be yours very sincerely,

A. C. CANTUAR."

In February a discussion was raised in both Houses of Convocation, but it was decided, with general approval, that no action should be taken until the Archbishop's return from abroad. When Convocation met in June, he was able to be again in the chair, and he explained in a careful speech the consistency of his former opposition with the readiness he now expressed to assent to the amended resolutions, the publication of which the Com-

mittee recommended. These were now reduced to four short and unadorned statements of plain fact as to the irregularity and presumption of the Vatican Council and its famous dogma. All reference to a future General Council—on which the Archbishop had expressed his view—and all attempt at elaborate argument or denunciation of Papal error were studiously avoided. To the resolution thus amended the Archbishop was able to give his unfeigned approval :—

“There was” [last year], he said, “an idea that in some way or other the Synod of this Province required to be cleared from complicity with the decrees of the Vatican Council. As a member of this Synod, I had not the slightest idea that we had any complicity whatsoever with the decrees of the Vatican Council, or that any one could suppose we had. I also felt that it was of the utmost importance that nothing should be put forth that could in the slightest degree lessen our intimate fellowship with those bodies of Protestant Christians who are not so regularly constituted as ourselves, but who have done good service in the maintenance of the Catholic faith, not only in this country, but on the Continent. . . . The resolution now proposed is of the fairest character ; it is drawn up in words to which nobody can properly object, and I think there need be no difficulty in accepting it. . . . I believe that the mission of the Church of England is the greatest mission in the world at this moment, and that there are men at Rome who, the more they become acquainted with the position which our Church bears towards Rome, the more they will respect us, and the more anxious they will be to adopt from us what ought to be adopted. . . . I most earnestly trust that they may learn from the Church of England how to unite true liberty with Christian faith, and real progress with the maintenance of order.”¹

It may not be out of place to refer, in this connection, to the attitude taken by the Archbishop a little later, in the still more difficult matter of the Old Catholic Congress at Cologne.

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, June 16, 1871, pp. 447-449.

The Bishop of Lincoln to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"RISEHOLME, LINCOLN,
13th July 1872.

"MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I received yesterday a letter from the Secretary of the proposed Cologne Congress of Old Catholics, inviting me to attend it in September. Before replying to the invitation, I feel it my duty to consult your Grace with respect to it. I should be unwilling to be present at the Congress if there should be any danger of my seeming to compromise the Church of England by my presence.

"My own inclination would be (in case I accepted the invitation) to state clearly the terms of the acceptance, viz., an adhesion, on one side, to all Scriptural and Catholic doctrine and discipline, as received by the Church of England; and on the other side, a negation of all Romish errors, novelties, and usurpations, as far as they are authoritatively rejected by ourselves.

"Would your Grace be disposed to advise or approve the appearance of any of the Suffragans of your Province at the Congress on such conditions as these?—I am, my dear Lord Archbishop, yours dutifully,
C. LINCOLN."

Bishop Harold Browne of Ely wrote in similar terms to announce that an invitation had reached him, and the Secretaries of the 'Anglo-Continental Society' reported that they also had been invited, and that their Committee was extremely anxious that Bishop Wordsworth and Bishop Harold Browne, as active members of the Society, should attend the Congress. The Archbishop replied as follows:—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of Lincoln.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
23d July 1872.

"MY DEAR LORD,—If the Anglo-Continental Society think it desirable to send any members of their body to be present at the meeting of the Old Catholics at Cologne, for the purpose of observing this very important movement, and of showing a Christian interest in their difficulties, I cannot suppose that

anything but good would result, provided care be taken in no way even to appear to commit the Church of England. I think it important that the presence of such deputies should be considered as the act of a private Society within our Church, and not to be under any authoritative sanction. Much as I, in common with yourself, feel interested in this movement of the Old Catholics, its development is a matter so uncertain and, as far as we know, at present so little in accordance with the protest which the Church of England has always made against the old doctrinal errors of Rome, that I feel the utmost caution is required, lest in any way we should seem to forget that our Reformers thought it right to separate themselves from Rome, quite independently of any assertion on the part of the Roman Church as to the personal infallibility of the Pope. I feel sure from the strong expressions of opinion on this subject to which you have often given utterance, that you will agree with me in this view as to the necessity for caution, while we allow that it is impossible for the Church of England not to regard with deepest sympathy the struggle in which Dr. Dollinger and his friends are engaged.—Believe me to be, my dear Bishop, yours very truly, A. C. CANTUAR.”

The Bishop of Ely to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“ELY HOUSE, DOVER STREET,
July 26, 1872.

“MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I am truly obliged to your Grace for the kind letter received by me, enclosing a copy of your letter to the Bishop of Lincoln.

“I see fully the force of your remarks on the position of our Church as protesting three centuries ago against Papal errors, as distinguished from the Old Catholics who only protest against Papal decrees of the last twenty years.

“I hoped to have heard from the Bishop of Lincoln. I shall be glad to arrange with him some answer to the invitation by which we may express our sympathy, without promising to join their Conference.—I am, my dear Lord Archbishop, your Grace’s affectionately and dutifully, E. H. ELY.”

Some of the English friends of the Old Catholics were disappointed with the Archbishop’s attitude, and

begged him to say more definitely whether he approved or disapproved of the attendance of the two Bishops at Cologne.

"I venture to ask from your Grace," wrote one of these friends, "an explanation of your letter. . . . The Bishop of — takes one view, and the Bishop of — takes the opposite view, as your Grace's meaning. . . . Will your Grace kindly inform me, and also write a few lines to the Bishops?"

The Archbishop replied :—

"The meaning of my letter to the Bishop of Lincoln was, I think, perfectly clear. I had no desire to hamper the movements either of the Bishop of Lincoln or the Bishop of Ely. I desired to leave both free to act as each thought best. Neither, I was sure, would compromise the Church of England, if they thought good to attend the Congress at Cologne. Having expressed myself as clearly as I could, I should not think it well to enter further on the question with either of the Bishops."

The sequel is well known. The two Bishops attended the Congress, and Bishop Wordsworth's full account of it was made public in the form of a letter to his diocese : one of the most important of existing documents respecting the origin and character of the Old Catholic movement in Germany.¹

¹ Bishop Wordsworth's *Miscellanies*, vol. i. pp. 449-481.

CHAPTER XXI.

RECOVERY FROM ILLNESS—JOURNEY ABROAD—VOYSEY
CASE—PURCHAS CASE—PLANS OF CHURCH REFORM
—ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS—LORD SHAFTESBURY—
COURT OF APPEAL—DIARY.

1870-73.

IT is necessary to return to the summer months of 1870. The Archbishop was slowly recovering strength, but any exertion of an unusual sort still tried him greatly, and he was conscious of more than one warning of the possible recurrence of his former attack. To his own mind there came again and again the thought that it might be his duty to accept these warnings as a sign that his public work was done, and that the resignation for which he had made preparation a few months before ought now to take effect. On September 25 he conducted an Ordination in Croydon Parish Church, and the exertion of the long service left him weak and feverish. More than one friend in the next few weeks found him anxious for counsel on the subject, and painfully conscious of the fact that the Church had been practically deprived for nearly a year of the personal guidance of its Primate, although he had endeavoured, by an ample and increasing correspondence, to make up as far as possible for his unwonted absence from public meetings, from Convocation, and above all from the Bishops' Bench in the House of Lords. On one night only, that session, had he been within the walls of Parliament.

was the night (July 15) on which it was authoritatively announced that war had been declared between Germany and France. Full of eagerness, he went not only to the House of Lords but to the gallery of the House of Commons. "Shall I ever forget," he writes, "Gladstone's face of earnest care when I saw him in the lobby?"

But these exertions had been quite unusual, and his few rapid visits to London were in almost defiance of his doctors' commands. He was allowed indeed, under Mrs. Tait's untiring guardianship, to have many guests at Addington, and the clergy from all parts of his diocese were invited there on business and pleasure; but his quota of daily work had to be jealously restricted, and a visit to Canterbury in October to attend a public meeting on the burning question of the Education Act proved almost to be beyond his strength. Could he in such circumstances continue with propriety to hold his office? Was his continuance in it for the real advantage of the Church? The question, as was natural, became to him a source of daily perplexity, and he once more insisted upon a conference of his doctors. Their decision was a deliberate and, as it proved, a wise one. Sir William Gull, as their spokesman, assured him that, little as such an issue could have been anticipated, there was nothing in his present condition to prevent an ultimate recovery. They deemed it, however, absolutely essential to the restoration of the nervous power which had been lost, that the next winter should be spent in a warmer climate than England. It was at once decided that this advice should be followed, and all present thought of resigning the Archbishopric laid aside. The Franco-German war was its height, and a journey across Europe was by no means free from difficulties. But by the help of Ambassadors and others these were reduced to a minimum.

"We started," he writes, "a very large party, sixteen in all, including children, chaplain, and my sister Lady Wake with her daughter. Our destination was the Riviera, but it was impossible to take the route through France. The interest of the journey was great to us all. From time to time, as we passed through Germany, we came upon traces of the war—French prisoners defiling before our hotel, an enormous train full of wounded returning to their homes, the hospital at Stuttgart, in which we found poor fellows, shot down at Gravelotte and elsewhere. My wife, as usual, threw herself as heartily as the youngest into the interest of all that was to be seen and done. It was an enjoyment to her when she induced me to visit and have a long conversation with Marshal Canrobert, detained on his parole at our hotel, and no one was more ready than she to visit with enthusiasm the sights which came in our way at Munich, Innsbruck, Verona, Venice, Milan, and Genoa."¹

The party reached San Remo before Christmas, and spent some four months in all on the Riviera, the Archbishop steadily regaining strength. Though carefully guarded from all unnecessary fatigue, he worked hard at his daily correspondence, and seized the opportunity to inform himself fully on several subjects connected with the controversies of the day. Among other tasks, he took great pains in preparing the judgment to be delivered by the Court of Appeal in Mr. Voysey's case.

The Rev. Charles Voysey, Vicar of Healaugh in the diocese of York, had published a series of sermons or essays delivered by him, to which he gave the significant name of *The Sling and the Stone*. Grave objection was immediately taken by Churchmen of all schools to the doctrines propounded in these sermons, and the Archbishop of York, urged both by High and Low Churchmen, decided at length on prosecuting Mr. Voysey in the Ecclesiastical Courts. The English Church Union offered, through its President, a contribution of £500

¹ *Catharine and Craufurd Tait*, p. 74.

towards the expenses of the prosecution, a gift which was declined by the Archbishop of York.

After preliminary proceedings in the Provincial Court of York, Mr. Voysey appealed to the Privy Council. His appeal was technically upon a point of law. But when this had been decided (against Mr. Voysey) both parties agreed that the whole cause, instead of being referred back to York, should be tried before the Privy Council then and there. It was on November 12, 1870, that the case came on for trial. This was but a few days before Archbishop Tait was to leave England, but it had been specially desired that he should if possible be one of the judges, the Archbishop of York being, by his position as prosecutor, debarred from taking any judicial part. Accordingly, notwithstanding the murmurs of his doctor, he took his seat at the table of the Privy Council, and threw himself actively into the consideration of the case. The indictment against Mr. Voysey was long and intricate, and dealt of necessity with some of the most solemn doctrines of the Christian Faith. The far-reaching character of the imputed 'heresies' will be made evident by the following short extracts from the formal 'Articles of Charge.' On the strength of a long series of passages from his writings—the authenticity of which was not disputed,—Mr. Voysey was charged with maintaining, in contradiction to the teaching of the Church of England:—

"That Christ has not made an atonement or reconciliation for sin, there being no place for such atonement or sacrifice in the purpose of God."

"That the Lord Jesus Christ is no more 'very God of very God' than we men are."

"That the worship of Christ is idolatry, and inconsistent with the worship of the true God."

"That the very idea of the Incarnation of the Son of God takes its rise in unbelief and springs out of absolute infidelity."

No one who had read the extracts taken from Mr. Voysey's works could have any real doubt as to the issue of the trial, and Mr. Voysey, who conducted his own defence, rested it, not upon any denial of the accusations, but upon a contention that others had been allowed without censure to indulge in a similar "laxity of interpretation" or belief. He added interest to his defence by accusing Dr. Pusey, Dr. Liddon, and other champions of Orthodoxy, of holding opinions similar to his own, and supported his contention by quotations from their works. Most of those whom he had thus associated with himself wrote to the newspapers to repudiate indignantly the interpretation he had placed upon their words. At the conclusion of the trial, which lasted for three days, the Court took time to consider its decision. After the Archbishop's arrival at San Remo, he received from the Lord Chancellor (Lord Hatherley) a rough draft of the proposed judgment, with a request that he would co-operate in giving it its final shape. To this task he devoted himself with the closest attention, and the result of the joint authorship was an elaborate and weighty decision in which each article of the indictment was separately handled. Mr. Voysey was condemned on almost every point, and sentence of deprivation was pronounced against him. An examination of the documents in their different stages shows that every single recommendation of the Archbishop's was adopted by his three colleagues—Lord Hatherley, Lord Chelmsford, and Sir Robert Phillimore—and incorporated in the formal judgment as finally pronounced on February 11, 1871.

The journal of these months of rest and recovery has very little of permanent interest. A single extract may suffice. Everything was dictated. He wrote at that time nothing whatever with his own hand.

Diary.

"*Sunday, March 12, 1871, CANNES.*—Our quiet life in this beautiful villa is very enjoyable. Church daily at 10 or 11. An hour or two of letters and business. Lovely drives and short walks. *Little Dorrit* with the children in the evening. Then Palmerston's Life and Cotton's. Deep interest of Cotton's Life, going back on our Rugby days. We have been reading the account of his death. I shall never forget seeing the telegram in the *Times* which announced it. The newspapers now take a long time daily, as the peace between Germany and France is just signed; and besides, I am obliged to keep up with all that goes on in England. I think I am content to leave my return to work in God's hands. The effect of this climate has been to increase my nervousness, but perhaps in God's good time this may be of use. There is a wonderful stillness in the Sundays here.

"Books read since we left home:—Wordsworth's *Tour in Italy*, vols. i. and ii. *The Initials*, a tale of German life. *Doctor Antonio* (Italian life near San Remo and Bordighera), by Ruffini. Leigh Hunt's *Stories from the Italian Poets*. *Dante*. Church's *Life of Anselm*. *Lord Palmerston's Life*. *Cotton's Life*. *Lorenzo Benoni*, by Ruffini. *The Draytons and the Davenants*."

The following is from the account he wrote nine years afterwards in the published memoir of Mrs. Tait:—

"We were, indeed, in a peaceful corner, but many of the people amongst whom we lived, especially at Mentone, had left their homes and dearest interests in Paris, or in other spots where the miseries of war were at their height. Her ardent nature could not comprehend the real or assumed indifference which some of those who lived with us in the same hotel showed in this very crisis of their country's fortune. I should have thought that their way of talking as to the miseries of besieged Paris was assumed, had it not been that when the elections for the Chamber came on, which were to decide the future fate of France, they would not, as we were informed, take the trouble of walking across the street to record their votes, as they were entitled to do in whatever place in France they were sojourning. The only Frenchman who, at Mentone, won her regard as a lover of his country was a

poor peasant whom we met one day in a long walk among the hills. He stopped us, and asked, 'What news from Paris?' We answered, 'The Prussians, we are told by to-day's paper, are entering the town. It has capitulated.' The old man fell on the ground as if he had been shot, and would not believe that such disgrace had come. He had served in the time of Charles x., and was now living by cultivating a few acres among the olives.

"Certainly the people did not show to great advantage as Frenchmen along this coast. Perhaps some of them scarcely looked upon themselves as fully incorporated with France. The changing of all the signs from 'Imperial' to 'National' within a few weeks was a sort of index of the fickleness of their patriotic affections. On one particular sign 'IMPÉRI' was effaced, and a blank left to fill up with 'NATION' or 'ROY,' as the case might be; and this probably afforded a true exposition of the popular mind."

It was during this absence of the Archbishop from England that the 'Purchas Judgment' was pronounced. He had nothing personally to do with it at any of its stages, but so many of the subsequent controversies turned upon the points then raised that it is necessary to recount the facts in outline.

In the summer of 1869 complaint was made to the Bishop of Chichester respecting the services conducted by the Rev. John Purchas in St. James's Chapel, Brighton. Bishop Gilbert transmitted the case to the Court of Arches, where it was tried by Sir Robert Phillimore in the month of November 1869. Mr. Purchas declined to appear either personally or by counsel, but evidence was given in support of the long series of charges alleged against him. The charges, which were so expanded as to fill sixteen printed pages, may be briefly summarised. They included the wearing of cope, chasuble, alb, and other vestments, the 'Eastward position,' the use of incense, of wafer-bread, of Holy Water, of Altar Lights, and

of a veiled crucifix ; the ceremonially mixed Chalice ; and generally the adoption of rites and ceremonies "not appointed by the laws ecclesiastical." These last included what was described as the rubbing of consecrated ashes upon the foreheads of the officiating clergy during the Ash Wednesday service, the giving to the congregation lighted candles which had been censed and sprinkled with Holy Water, and the ceremonial use of "the stuffed skin of a dove," and of a modelled figure of the infant Saviour, as well as the observance of Saints' Days and Festivals other than those appointed in the Book of Common Prayer. The Dean of Arches, having heard evidence upon these points and reserved his decision for some weeks, delivered an elaborately argued judgment on February 3, 1870. In this judgment he decided against Mr. Purchas upon many of the points complained of, admonishing him to discontinue most of the practices to which exception had been taken. On the following points, however, among others, he declined to decide that Mr. Purchas had acted illegally—the use of the Eucharistic vestments ; of the Eastward position, of wafer-bread, and (when the mixing was non-ceremonial) of the mixed Chalice. These were the very points to which the chief importance was attached both by High and Low Churchmen, and an appeal to the Privy Council against Sir Robert Phillimore's decision was immediately lodged by Mr. Hebbert, the promoter of the suit.¹

The case came before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council² in November 1870, but the judgment of the Court was not delivered until February 23, 1871.

¹ The original promoter was Colonel Charles James Elphinstone, but he died during the progress of the suit, and permission was obtained to substitute Mr. Henry Hebbert's name as promoter.

² Consisting of the Lord Chancellor (Lord Hatherley), Archbishop Thomson of York, Bishop Jackson of London, and Lord Chelmsford.

It was a very long and careful document, which has furnished a basis for many subsequent controversies, and from the elaborate arguments it adduces, and from its constant references to authorities more or less ambiguous or obscure, it was necessarily vulnerable at many points. Briefly summarised, it reversed the decision of the Dean of Arches on all the important points which he had decided in Mr. Purchas's favour. It declared the vestments, the Eastward position, the wafer-bread, and the mixed Chalice to be all illegal, and condemned Mr. Purchas in the costs both of the suit and the appeal.

The result was absolute consternation among the High Churchmen, who had for more than a year been rejoicing in the Dean of Arches' decision, and it became evident at once that the dissatisfaction would not be confined to those who had hitherto protested against the restraint of their ritual freedom, but would extend to High Churchmen generally; and this less perhaps on the ground of actual sympathy with the now condemned practices, than of a feeling of indignation against the apparent bias exhibited, as the critics thought, by the Privy Council judges, lay and clerical. Intimation of the coming storm reached the Archbishop while still abroad.

The Bishop of Winchester to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“NEAR SOUTHAMPTON, *March 9, 1871.*

“MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,—I enclose you an autograph letter from the King [of Hawaii] asking for a Bishop for the Islands. I have written to Bishop Whipple.

“We are in sad trouble as to this last decision of the Privy Council, and I greatly fear the result. The mere suppression of Vestments would have passed quietly enough, but the imperative injunction to consecrate at the north end cuts far deeper and will not be obeyed. Men feel the one-sidedness of the judgment; the playing with words in deciding that ‘standing before

the table' is not to mean standing before it when Purchas is condemned and is to mean it when Mackonochie is. They feel the separation from antiquity, the breaking through a custom which has prevailed always in some churches: the narrowing of liberty: the unfairness of attempting to prevent this whilst copes are not enforced or surplices. It is a very distracting time, and unless God hears our prayers will end in a great schism. I should be glad of a bulletin from you, and with affectionate remembrances to Catharine, I am your affectionate cousin,

"S. WINTON."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of Winchester.

"CHÂTEAU ÉLÉONORE, CANNES,

15 March 1871.

"MY DEAR BISHOP,—I have your letter enclosing the King of Hawaii this morning. I shall write an answer to the King to be sent through you in a few days, D.V.

"Meanwhile I lose not a post in writing respecting other matters. I have read the Purchas judgment carefully, and the letters in the *Guardian*. I confess I think it will be a great mistake if the High Church party generally excite themselves respecting the position at the Communion table. Of course the Vestments will be dropped, because they will be legally complained against, and Bishops will be called to enforce the law; but in minor matters we do not all observe all the Rubrics, and till there is formal complaint, no harm is done. What the judgment has done is to state the law in case it be appealed to; but not every one is forced to be strictly rubrical. Only, as it strikes me, we the Bishops must be, as we always have been, ready to enforce the law in cases which are brought before us in a legal way.—Your affectionate cousin, A. C. CANTUAR."

To a clergyman of his diocese the Archbishop wrote as follows:—

"CHÂTEAU ÉLÉONORE, CANNES,

March 16, 1871.

"MY DEAR MR.——,—You may feel perfectly confident of my sympathy in any difficulties in which you yourself and your friends are involved by the recent decision in Mr. Purchas's case.

The important point in that judgment seems to me to be, that those vestments which in the rare cases of their adoption have proved so great a cause of offence are now, in accordance with the opinion of the most eminent of our lawyers long ago taken by the Bishops, finally declared to be illegal. Respecting other matters touched by the judgment, on which I understand you to be disquieted, if in any respect you feel your own practice, or that of other clergy of various opinions, not to be strictly in accordance with the legal requirements of the Rubric, I shall, knowing how difficult it is to introduce changes from established practice, and how delicately such things ought to be dealt with, be ready, please God, on my return home to give to you or any other of my clergy who may desire it, my best advice on full consideration of the circumstances of each of your parishes.

"What I would earnestly press upon you and others at the present moment is, to avoid any unnecessary excitement or the magnifying of difficulties which will probably disappear when, as I trust may soon be the case, we have an opportunity of calmly going over the points which at present disquiet you.—Yours sincerely,
A. C. CANTUAR."

Before many weeks had elapsed, a Memorial or protest against the judgment was drawn and circulated for clerical signature, the number of signatures ultimately obtained being about 4700. The document was as follows :—

"To the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England.

"WE, the undersigned Clergy of the Church of England, hereby offer our solemn remonstrance against the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of 'Hebbert v. Purchas.'

"Without referring to all the points involved in this judgment, we respectfully submit the following considerations touching the position of the minister during the Prayer of Consecration at the Holy Communion :—

"1. That the rubrics affecting this particular question having been diversely observed, ever since they were framed, the Judicial Committee has given to these rubrics a restrictive interpreta-

tation condemnatory of a usage which has continuously existed in the Church of England, and has for many years widely prevailed.

"2. That this decision is opposed to the comprehensive spirit of the Reformed Church of England, and thus tends to narrow the Church to the dimensions of a sect.

"3. That this restriction will press very unfairly upon a large body of clergy who have never attempted, by resort to law or otherwise, to abridge the liberty of those whose practice differs from their own.

"4. That the rigorous enforcement of a decision so painful as this is to the consciences of those whom it affects might involve the gravest consequences to a large number of the clergy and lead to results most disastrous to the Established Church.

"On these grounds, although many of us are not personally affected by the judgment, we earnestly trust that your Lordships will abstain from acting upon this decision, and thus preserve the ancient liberty of the Church of England."

On reading this protest in the newspapers the Archbishop immediately wrote as follows to the Memorialists, who were headed by Bishops M'Dougall and Abraham, and by the Deans of Chichester, Durham, York, and St. Asaph.

"CANNES, *April 6, 1871.*

"DEAR BRETHREN,—My attention has been called to a paper to which your names are appended, purporting to contain 'a solemn remonstrance against the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in the case of *Hebbert v. Purchas*.'

"The uncertainty of my direction during my journey home from this place to England¹ may make it difficult for me to send an answer to your address so soon as I could wish after its presentation. Meanwhile the gravity of the consequences involved in its publication seems to me to call for an immediate expression of opinion on my part respecting its contents. I have perceived that an application has been made by petition to Her Majesty in Council for the rehearing of this case. The presentation of such a petition, if fitting grounds for a rehearing can

¹ See p. 101.

be alleged, seems to me perfectly constitutional, and, of course, it may turn out after all that the lately delivered recommendation of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to Her Majesty may not prove to be the final judgment of the Court of Appeal. But in the document to which your names are appended this recommendation is treated as the judgment of the highest Court, and I feel myself constrained to make some remarks upon your remonstrance, viewed in this aspect, lest serious misapprehensions should get abroad as to the duty of the clergy in reference to the decisions of our Courts.

"I trust you will allow me to remark that I have some difficulty in clearly understanding the exact meaning of this paper ; though, perhaps, the ambiguity of which I feel disposed to complain is inseparable from the nature of a document intended to embrace so great a variety of signatures of earnest-minded men as I find attached to it.

"I confess the circulation and publication of a remonstrance against a decision of any of our highest Courts of Appeal seems to me both unusual and inconvenient. Those who are dissatisfied with our laws, ecclesiastical or civil, as explained by our highest tribunals, have a perfect right to use every legitimate means, by petition or otherwise, to obtain an alteration of the law ; or, again, if they consider the Court of Appeal to be improperly formed, it is a perfectly right course to apply to the legislature for an alteration of the nature of the Court. But the publication of a remonstrance against the decision of the legally appointed judges in any particular case seems to me scarcely the right way of attaining either of these objects. Indeed the present remonstrance might, at first sight, appear to imply an accusation against Lord Chancellor Hatherley, the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, and Lord Chelmsford, of either being ignorant of the law which they are called upon to interpret, or of having perverted its interpretation for an unrighteous party purpose.

"I feel confident, dear Brethren, that you intended no such accusation. But as little can I suppose that you wish to enunciate the principle that the Judges of our supreme Courts of Appeal are bound not to interpret the law according to their consciences, but rather, in delivering their judgments, to accommodate its provisions to the changeable rule of what may seem to be immediately expedient.

"Again, I feel myself at a loss, quite to understand the request which—upon the supposition, as I apprehend your meaning, that final judgment has been delivered—you make to the Bishops, 'that they should abstain from acting upon this decision,' being certain that you do not so estimate the Bishop's office as to consider it superior to the law, and that you will at once acknowledge with me that the chief Pastors of our Church are of all men the very last who ought to be requested to set to this nation the example of refusing obedience to the highest tribunals. Such obedience I feel sure you consider to be the duty of all good citizens, and to be especially incumbent on all Ministers of Christ, not only in our own Church, but among Nonconformists. And here I will remark that Roman Catholics and all bodies of Dissenters are liable to be continually called upon, like ourselves, to submit the terms of their contracts, in matters most intimately affecting their doctrine and discipline, to the decision of the Courts of Law. This is an obligation from which no section of the community can escape under a well-ordered Government; and in the records of our Courts we have continually recurring instances of such decisions affecting the principal religious bodies in the kingdom.

"I believe, however, that the real object of your remonstrance, notwithstanding what I trust you will excuse me for calling the ambiguity of its wording, is merely this: You are anxious lest the late decision should lead to a rigorous investigation into the exact mode in which the rubrics which are the subject of that judgment are complied with in every parish in England. You, therefore, fear lest the liberty of the clergy may be unduly interfered with, and you deprecate the evil which might arise from the sudden introduction in many parishes of changes from practices which you believe have given no offence, and which have been adopted under the conscientious conviction that they were not irreconcilable with the law. I will not, therefore, hesitate to remind you that the whole practice of the Episcopate of England, in the administration of its duties, is averse to anything like tyrannical interference with individual liberty. We have long learned by experience that we can trust our clergy, and, except when complaints are made against their mode of performing Divine Service, our rule is to leave them to act according to their own consciences, under direction of the rubrics.

"I have already intimated to others that what I conceive this

judgment has done is to state the law in reference to the illegality of the so-called sacrificial vestments, and in reference to the position of the officiating minister at the celebration of the Holy Communion. The rubrics, interpreted by the supreme Court, form the lawful rule of Divine Service to which the clergy are bound to yield a loyal obedience, and of which they are bound to observe every particular *when required by authority*. But certainly, as a matter of fact, not all the clergy are expected by their parishioners, or required by their Bishops, rigidly to observe every point in the rubrics at all times and under all circumstances.

"No doubt, in such matters, the clergy will be ready to listen to the paternal advice of their Bishops, which I feel sure will always be given with full consideration of the particular circumstances of our parishes, and of the delicacy and difficulty of introducing changes from established usage. Still, in points where the law is clear, the chief officers of the Church must of course be prepared to enforce its observance in cases which are brought before them in a legal way.

"Suffer me, dear Brethren, in conclusion, to beg you not to be disquieted by any strifes respecting matters affecting the vestments or posture of the clergy. Such things cannot touch your teaching of the Gospel of Christ, or affect the validity of His Sacraments. In days when every effort is required to resist ungodliness and infidelity, all our zeal and energy ought to be directed to the promotion of real religion amongst our people.

"Earnestly praying that you and all your brethren of our National Church may heartily unite with one mind in the furtherance of this great object,—I am, your faithful brother and servant,
A. C. CANTUAR."

The homeward journey is described by him as follows in the memoir of Mrs. Tait:—

"It had been difficult to reach Cannes during the war, and it was not less difficult to return. The route by Paris certainly presented no attractions for an Archbishop and his family, for the Commune was in possession, and Monseigneur Darboy was in the hands of the insurgents. We had nearly resolved to return by Marseilles, and from thence through Switzerland, when a lady, whose husband we knew at Mentone, gave the following report

of her adventures by that route :—She was quietly sitting in the hotel at Marseilles, when the landlord entered and said, ‘Madame, the town is in insurrection ; you have two courses open to you—either hide in the cellar, or make the best of your way to the railway station, and be off.’ She chose the latter alternative, found the railway station surrounded by soldiers who had gathered there to shoot the insurgents whom they had captured, and condemned by drum-head court-martial. The executions were going on ; nevertheless she was fortunate enough to catch a train and reach Lyons. There she breathed freely, and anticipated some rest. But, again, when she was seated in her hotel, and endeavouring to recover her self-possession, the waiter confidentially approached her : ‘Perhaps Madame is not aware that one half of this hotel is turned into a small-pox hospital ; we have just received here and at the station the remnant of Bourbaki’s routed army.’ . . . We were still fourteen in number, and some of us not prepared for such rapid locomotion as this lady had found necessary. There was nothing for it but to retrace our steps through the north of Italy, and over the Brenner. And again the journey, which gave us several delightful days at Milan, and amid the Italian lakes in all the brightness of the early May, was full of interest. We reached Dover on the eve of Ascension Day, 17th May 1871, an eve destined seven years afterwards to be very memorable for my wife and me and all of us. . . .

“The country we had left was still racked in the convulsions which the war had caused. There had been the murder of the Archbishop and the other hostages in Paris, and the news came to us in our quiet home that the city was being burnt by the followers of the Commune. A few peaceful days at Addington, in the full enjoyment of the first burst of the rhododendrons, sent us on to our accustomed work at Lambeth, my dear wife’s heart full to overflowing with gratitude to God.”

To the amazement of his friends—not excepting some of the medical authorities—the Archbishop seemed able on his return to do almost as much work as in former years. The summer was spent in a ceaseless round of conferences, meetings, and Parliamentary debates. An enthusiastic welcome greeted him when he rose in the House of Lords on June 9 for the first time since his illness, and on at

least two subsequent occasions the newspapers recorded specially the unexpected vigour of his speeches. The session was singularly prolific in small Ecclesiastical Bills, no less than five such measures receiving the Royal Assent,¹ while several others were under long debate. To one of these it will be necessary to refer hereafter.

The following extracts are from his Diary:—

"Sunday, June 11, 1871, LAMBETH.—Thank God, we are here again, and I seem able to take my share of work. Thank God for His great mercy. I was very kindly received in speaking in the House of Lords on Friday on Lord Shaftesbury's Bill. . . . To-day my two brothers and three sisters joined with us in the Holy Communion in the Chapel, a remarkable gathering, seeing how old and frail we all are. . . .

"Sunday, June 18, ADDINGTON.—We have come down here for a peaceful Sunday, after a very hard week in London. . . . On Tues., Wed., Thurs., Frid. I presided in Convocation, steering through difficult discussions—public and private—on the Athanasian Creed, on the Marriage of Divorced Persons, on the Purchas Judgment, on the Vatican Council, and on the State of Religion in Italy. I found the work trying, but, thank God, I do not feel the worse for it. Correspondence and interviews, as of old, have filled up all spare time, but I have managed a good deal of fresh air, and rest in the evenings, though Lambeth, as usual, has been full of friends. . . . On Wednesday I went to the Prince's Levée—the first time for two years—and now my beloved and I are enjoying the calmness of a Sunday evening together, though even here the squabble about the Judicial Committee has followed us for half an hour. . . . Would that the clergy and laity of England would understand the momentous nature of the present crisis of Europe, and leave off vexing their souls about small matters.

"Sunday, July 2, 1871, ADDINGTON.—A fortnight has passed. In these weeks I have had the opening of S. Thomas' Hospital, when, for the first time since my illness, I met the Queen. On Thursday spoke in the House of Lords on the Judicial Committee. On Friday met the Queen again at

¹ Viz., those relating to the Lectionary, to Church Buildings, to the Resignation of Benefices, to the Union of Benefices, and to Sequestration.

Buckingham Palace garden party. . . . The negotiations about the Lectionary Bill on which Gladstone was much tried have been brought to a satisfactory conclusion by my acting as mediator between him and —. Much business, correspondence, interviews, Ecclesiastical Commission, etc. I held a Court on Friday in the guard-room to hear counsel about the union of parishes. . . . Attended the Committee of the British Museum for the first time since my illness. It was the day of Mr. Grote's funeral, which gave melancholy to the meeting. . . . Have read a good part of Bishop Hampden's Life. I am very thankful to have stood my work well thus far. . . . This quiet Sunday with the Holy Communion has been a blessing to us.

" *Monday, July 10, ADDINGTON.*—Last week telegraphed for to dine and sleep at Windsor on Wednesday. . . . H. M. received me most kindly. After dinner she spoke very freely about the mistakes made in Convocation last spring, and in the Ritual Commission. . . . Back to town next morning. Business and interviews all day. Large reception at Lambeth. But as Ecclesiastical matters pressed in the H. of Lords I had to leave my friends. Spoke more than once in the House. . . . I feel especially thankful that four Ecclesiastical measures recommended by me from San Remo have now passed both Houses. See Leading Article in *Times* of Friday. On Saturday a most important meeting at Lambeth of twenty-one Bishops on the Athanasian Creed—minutes of the meeting preserved. . . . Great gathering at Lambeth last Thursday; about 3000 people were present. Service for the Orphan Home in the Parish Church; Mr. Moorhouse preached. Early in the day the little Prussian Princes William and Henry came to see Lambeth at their mother's request. They went all over the place. What are the chances, in these changeful times, of that slight, fair, intelligent boy ever becoming Emperor of a united Germany? People in general seem to feel an intense interest in Lambeth. That day there were all sorts present, from the French Ambassador to our old tradesmen at Fulham. On Friday I made a speech at the Mansion House on the claims of the Irish Church to assistance from England. Afterwards the army debate in H. of Lords.

"Have been reading in the last [few weeks] *Palmerston's Life*; *Brougham's Life*, vol. ii.; *Hampden's Life*; *Cotton's Life*; *Trench's Ierne*; *Howard's Christians of S. Thomas*; *Temple's*

Letter to his Clergy; Gates Ajar; Robert Falconer; Reichel's Popes of the Middle Ages.

"*Sunday, July 23, LAMBETH.*—*Tuesday*, division in House of Lords on Army Bill. A gain to Government. Paired in favour of the Government. *Wednesday*, Cardwells and Frederick Oakeley dined with us. A strange remembrance of thirty-five years and more! . . . Communion to-day in parish church and quiet service in chapel here. . . .

"*Sunday, July 30, LAMBETH.*—A busy week—very. Spoke in House of Lords on Private Chapels Bill. . . . On S. James' Day, dear Lucy's confirmation in Lambeth Palace Chapel. Thank God I have lived to confirm this dear child. . . . On *Wedy*. Queen Anne's Bounty. British Museum Election. Corporation of Sons of Clergy. *Thursday*, Ecclesiastical Commission. Candidates for Ordination. *Friday*, bad attack in the morning, to remind me. H. of Lords in the evening for three hours. *Saturday*, deputation of S. P. G. at Lambeth for two hours. . . . Distressed, on looking back, to find how little of the late work is spiritual. But in the diocese I can resume more. . . . Ceaseless letters and business. Prize-giving at Croydon and a speech on education. I begin now to read to myself a good deal."

The Archdeacons and Rural Deans of the diocese met at Addington in October, and the Archbishop's speech, the substance of which was made public, foreshadowed the legislation he was planning for the following year.

He expressed a confident hope that useful measures might be carried if only Churchmen would be less suspicious of Parliament and less easily alarmed.

"It is a common idea," he said, "that Parliament is anxious to press changes on the Church against its will. I am quite sure the very contrary is the case. A few foolish individuals may have such plans, but not Parliament as a whole. The difficulty lies, not in resisting legislation on ecclesiastical matters, but in getting good measures carried. Parliament holds back from sanctioning Church reform which it is not evident that the Church desires. We live in an age when noisy minorities make themselves heard all over the world, but we may depend upon

it that no legislation directly affecting the Church itself will be carried against the will of the Church."

He went on to describe the various schemes of Lord Shaftesbury, Lord Sandon, and others, for giving increased strength to the Ecclesiastical Courts, and for securing the right of lay Churchmen to have a voice in the Ritual matters which concerned them so closely.

"These things prove," he added, "that the laity of the Church are determined not to be set aside in questions that pertain to the conduct of Divine Service. It remains, therefore, to ascertain which of the modes proposed shall most approve itself to the clergy, or, failing them all, whether another may, in their judgment, better answer the desired purpose."

The subjects which seemed to him most pressing were the need of some greater elasticity in the forms of daily service, and the adaptation of Cathedral Statutes to the needs of modern times.

There was nothing very new or startling in the proposals, and the Archbishop describes in his diary the "puzzled amusement" with which he read the exaggerated comments of the newspapers upon the suggestions he had made,—suggestions adopted with practical unanimity a few weeks later at a meeting of the Bishops of both Provinces.

"We are promised a movement in Church Reform," said the *Times*, "such as has not been seen since the enactment of the Act of Uniformity."

"Here is the Primate," said another paper, "overhauling some of the most fundamental positions of his Church, and submitting them to public scrutiny. . . . To a Bishop of the old régime such a suggestion would appear nothing short of revolutionary, but Archbishop Tait evidently believes that a genuine and thorough reform may spare a revolution. It is this admirable spirit which renders his

manifesto nothing short of a great event. . . . It is a new Reformation, precipitated by no hostile reaction from without, but spontaneously springing from the new life within.”¹

In December all other subjects were forgotten in the anxiety awakened by the alarming illness of the Prince of Wales.

Diary.

“*Sunday, Dec. 10, 1871, LAMBETH.*—On Friday the telegrams about the Prince became more alarming, and great apprehensions were entertained towards night. On Saturday morning I had a letter from Mr. Gladstone which led to my immediately publishing an address to the clergy on the subject of prayer for the Prince, as it was thought the regular prayers could hardly be issued in time. The Privy Council was summoned at 3, and I prepared two collects to be ready for it. These were immediately ordered to be printed and circulated. To-day prayer has been used in all the Churches. I took part in the service in the Parish Church, and went in the afternoon to Westminster to hear the Dean preach, the others to S. Paul’s to hear Liddon. The sermons well expressed the deep public anxiety. . . .

“*Sunday, Dec. 17, ADDINGTON.*—This anxious week has passed, and the Prince has wonderfully rallied in answer to the prayers of the whole country. The Prayer was delivered by the Queen’s Printer with wonderful rapidity on Saturday night, and reached most places by telegram before the service on Sunday. It was sent round to the London clergy in the middle of the night. The anxiety throughout has been intense. On the 14th, the anniversary of his father’s death, the change seems to have come, as General Knollys tells me in his letter from Sandringham. On that day I wrote to the Queen at Sandringham. The loyal feeling of the country has been wonderfully drawn out. . . .

“*S. Thomas’ Day, 21st Dec. 1871.*—My birthday. This day I am 60. This certainly at last is the entrance on old age, and my weakness of body makes it most truly so to me. Many have been God’s mercies since that snowy S. Thomas’ Day two years ago, when I was just able to crawl to the window at Stonehouse

¹ *Daily Telegraph*, Oct. 10, 1871.

to see the procession moving off for the foundation of the Orphanage. Many the mercies since this day last year when I was at San Remo. . . . Lord, grant that entering now distinctly on old age I may more than ever before dedicate what remains of life in its evening to Thy service, through Jesus Christ !”

Two months later it fell to the Archbishop to preach the sermon in St. Paul's Cathedral at the great Thanksgiving Service of February 27, 1872. As the crowd swept from the Cathedral on that day, Sir William Gull, physician both to the Prince and the Archbishop, found himself side by side with Mrs. Tait. “I want to tell you,” he said, “how appropriate I think it, that the Archbishop should have been the preacher to-day. As I looked from the figure in the Royal Pew to the figure in the pulpit, I felt that of these two great recoveries the Archbishop's is the more wonderful by far.”

The following are the references in his Diary :—

“*Sunday, 21st Jan. 1872.*—Summoned last Thursday to the Privy Council, respecting the Service of Thanksgiving for the Prince of Wales. I had prepared a prayer, . . . and we had at the Council to discuss a private letter of Samuel Morley to Gladstone, asking for some alteration in the form commanding the Thanksgiving. William Forster, as knowing most of the Dissenters, gave us his advice, and concurred that we could not safely depart from precedent. Morley's letter complained nominally of the ‘command,’ and said that what they wanted was some kindly request such as that contained in the Queen's late letter to her people, but I take it the gravamen of the complaint lay really in the phrase used in the Proclamation, which commands prayer in all ‘churches and chapels,’ thereby implying that the Dissenters' meeting-houses are neither. It was pointed out that Morley did not at all necessarily represent the Dissenters, and that many of them would probably resent advice from the Privy Council quite as much as commands. So the matter stands. . . .

“*Sunday, March 3, 1872.*—Last Tuesday the Thanksgiving at S. Paul's. I went with my two chaplains and two train-bearers at 11 o'clock, escorted by two mounted policemen who made

way for my carriage. We were thus able to return by the whole line of the procession, and saw a wonderful spectacle. . . . Deeply thankful to God that I was able to bear my part."

The Diary of 1872 presents, as a whole, few points of interest. The following extracts are perhaps worth preserving :—

"*Sunday, 18th Feby. 1872.*—Preached to-day in the Chapel Royal, S. James, for the first time for three years. Thank God for His mercy that I have been able to lift my voice again there. . . . Preached on 'the whole creation groaneth and travaileth.' Not much tired. It is a great privilege to urge the simple Gospel of Christ on men's hearts. . . ."

"*June 9, 1872.*—We have spent some days in Oxford this week. A luncheon at Woolcombe's, in Balliol, to meet Oakeley and Ward. Then visited Baldon, where I found the old church of Marsh Baldon in the same state as when I preached my first sermon in it in 1836. All the old people whom I knew are dead, and I could recognise but few of the younger, except Farmer — and his aunt, living in two adjoining houses, whom we visited. . . . Snell dinner at Balliol in the Hall, and gathering in the evening. The dinner most interesting. The Hall was filled with young fellows of Colleges, and others whom I had never seen before, and at the high table were Oakeley, Ward, Woolcombe, Palmer, Lord Vane, Sir B. Brodie, etc., with Jowett presiding as Master. Nothing could have been in better taste than Jowett's speech, with his reminiscences of the old Balliol Common Room. Oakeley was greatly touched by my notice of what I owed to him. . . ."

"I have been reading carefully the Bennett Judgment, with the wisdom and justice of which I concur. I have also read over my article in the *Edinburgh Review* of 1854 on University and other Education. Curious to notice how the seventeen years that have passed have seen almost all the improvements I advocated carried into effect. . . ."

"*July 7, 1872.*—Yesterday, occupied all the morning with the Japanese Commissioner of Education. We had an interesting conversation on the educational prospects of Japan, and the possibility of Christianity being advanced there by a good system

of education imported from Europe. The interpreter represented Japan as having undergone of late years a great revolution by the deposition of the Tycoon, and the overthrow of the power of the ancient nobility. He represented the country as now eager for European knowledge. The interpreter had been many years in America, and is a Christian. The Commissioner speaks no English. I gave them introductions and such advice as I could. As soon as they were gone I had an interview with the Bishop of Jerusalem on the subject of the Bishop of Tyre and Sidon's desire to be recognised by the Church of England. The letters on this subject explain the state of the case."

"15th Dec. 1872, *Third Sunday in Advent*.—I yesterday received at Lambeth a large deputation from the three Sunday Observance Societies, headed by Samuel Morley. Afterwards I showed the deputation over the house. Half of them, dissenters, were specially interested in seeing Lambeth. I showed Morley where 'his people' had rifled and desecrated Parker's Tomb, and I showed them the way to the Lollards' prison. Then an important interview about Madagascar. Then British Museum meeting. At five the Lord Mayor and his chaplain came to see me about Hospital Sunday, which I arranged.

"To-day we have had a most interesting service for the consecration of three real missionary bishops in Westminster Abbey, Dr. Miller preaching, and 200 people communicating. The bishops consecrated were Dr. Royston for Mauritius, Mr. Horden for Moosonee, and Dr. Russell for North China. There were eight consecrating bishops, including Bishop M'Ilvaine in his black robes. He seemed disposed to stand aside, on account of his dress, but, remembering Miles Coverdale at Parker's consecration, I invited him to join us. What cause of thankfulness that I have been again able to consecrate in Westminster Abbey! The last was Moberly's consecration 1869. Our hearts were full of thankfulness."

The Parliamentary session of 1872 was, as the Archbishop had anticipated, a busy one.

On March 11 he introduced a bill to authorise, under certain conditions, a shortened form of Service in parish churches, and the measure became law almost

without opposition.¹ Similarly, a bill introduced by the Prime Minister for facilitating the resignation of deans and canons no longer able for their work received in a few weeks the royal assent,² the Archbishop expressing his confident hope of being able before long to promote "more extensive legislation" with respect to cathedrals and their uses. A different reception was accorded to Lord Shaftesbury's renewed endeavour to carry a bill through Parliament for the reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts. The subject is so important in itself, and so closely connected with what happened a few years later, that it is necessary to go back a little and to recount the facts with care.

No sooner had the great Ritual Commission made its report on Rubrics than Lord Shaftesbury besought the House of Lords to take immediate action to suppress illegal ritual. "I am only the mouthpiece," he said, "of the Protestant feeling of the country, and the fate of the Church of England is trembling in the balance." The House refused to take this alarmist view of the position, Lord Salisbury protesting that "to listen to the tone of menace in which his noble friend indulged, one would imagine that there was a Barebones Parliament sitting in the other House, and a Puritan minister storming at their Lordships' bar."³

On the first night of the following session (1869) Lord Shaftesbury introduced a bill dealing at enormous length with the whole subject. Bishop Tait had in the interim succeeded to the Primacy, and though perfectly willing in due time to undertake the task himself, he was by no means prepared to accept Lord Shaftesbury's measure. As soon, therefore, as he heard of the noble Lord's intention he wrote to him as follows :—

¹ 35 and 36 Vict. cap. 35.

² 35 Vict. cap. 8.

³ *Hansard*, May 15, 1868, p. 334.

"I think it will be well for me, if you now give notice of bringing in your bill in February, to say something to this effect : 'That through the courtesy of the noble earl I have had an opportunity of reading the draft of his proposed bill : that I can assure him it is my wish, and (so far as I can ascertain it) the wish of my right reverend brethren, that this subject should be speedily and effectually dealt with, and I believe such is also the wish of the clergy generally, as all are agreed that the present cumbrous and expensive system ought to be amended : that I propose, with the noble earl's consent, to take the matter in hand and bring in a bill at the earliest possible opportunity, going carefully through the suggestions contained in his bill, which, so far as I have been able to judge, does not differ in many points from what has already obtained the sanction of the bishops, and what I had intended, quite independently of him, to propose.' . . . My earnest desire is to take that course, whatever it is, which is most likely to lead to a satisfactory result, in securing an amended Church Discipline Act, which may obviate present difficulties."

Lord Shaftesbury, however, preferred to persevere, and replied :—

"May I be allowed to remind you that I have for two sessions given notice that I should introduce a measure for the amendment of the Ecclesiastical Courts? . . . I regret that I find much difficulty in complying with the request of your lordship . . . and I feel the necessity of laying the bill on the table this very evening; but I accept the alternative your lordship is so good as to propose, that a bill, drawn by the bishops, should be presented in February, and run *pari passu* with mine, so that the Lords may be enabled to consider our respective measures."

This course was adopted. The Archbishop introduced, along with Lord Shaftesbury's bill, a bill of his own, a bill which had the tacit concurrence of the whole Episcopate, and, after considerable debate, the two were referred together to a Select Committee.¹ It was the year of the

¹ *Hansard*, April 15, 1869, pp. 808-839.

Irish Church Disestablishment, and when the Select Committee reported on July 15, there was clearly no time to proceed further, and the subject was postponed until the following year.

Lord Shaftesbury's published diary gives a characteristic record of what he felt in this matter—a record which reads a little curiously alongside of the foregoing correspondence :—

“Never again,” he writes, “will I interfere in Church matters. All establishments are doomed, and perhaps wisely. . . . The Ecclesiastical Courts Bill has excited more attention than the subject ever did before, and yet I wish I had never undertaken it. My bill is very long, somewhat intricate, and upon a subject with which I am not at all conversant. I shall be opposed by all the bishops, who are masters of the question, and who secretly abhor the measure, as touching their dignity and their patronage. . . . The bill will go to a Select Committee, where I, being alone, without a single friend, shall find myself in the hands of bishops, lawyers, and peers, who hate me and love the abuses. But, God helping me, I shall at any rate exhibit the evils. Nevertheless, I wish it were over and settled, for never again will I touch so hopeless, so thankless, so fruitless a work as the reform of Church abominations.”

And again—

“(April 15th.) The motion is over. I bless God it was accomplished without shame and exposure. . . . I have now, thank God, closed my ecclesiastical career; nothing shall again stir me to move bills in defence of the establishment.”¹

Opinions will differ as to what might have been the result to the Church had Lord Shaftesbury adhered to this resolve. No sooner had the next session opened than the indomitable old man introduced another bill, founded on the report of the Select Committee of the previous year. The Archbishop's illness made it impos-

¹ *Life of Lord Shaftesbury*, vol. iii. pp. 246-248.

sible for him to be present. And it was with the utmost difficulty that Lord Shaftesbury was induced to yield to the wish expressed from every part of the House that he should on that account postpone for a few weeks the debate upon the second reading.¹ In July, the Archbishop being still absent, the bill passed a second reading, on the understanding that it should go no further.

It reappeared, according to promise, in the following session (1871), and on June 9 it passed a second reading without a division. The Archbishop, speaking for the first time since his illness, supported the second reading, but foretold that the bill must be largely amended in committee. He thought it most desirable, however, that the matter should now be dealt with once for all—and this wearisome and exaggerated controversy concluded.

"I should be surprised," he said, "to find a man who entertains a stronger objection to litigation in ecclesiastical affairs than I do. No one can be more pained than I have been at the spectacle of laymen as well as clergymen concentrating their whole attention upon vestments and matters of ceremonial at a time when no man with eyes in his head can look at the state of Europe without regretting that such matters should occupy the attention of those whose thoughts and best exertions should be devoted to the ungodliness and ignorance which disgrace the century in which we live and which require all the efforts of the clergy and laity to remove."²

Bishop Wilberforce also supported the second reading of the bill :—

"He was perfectly convinced that there was need of a measure of reform, and he felt it would be very difficult for any one occupying a seat on the Episcopal bench to introduce, with any hope of success, a satisfactory measure, and he was therefore delighted to see a layman making laborious endeavours to remedy the evils that existed."³

¹ *Hansard*, March 17, 1870, p. 64.

² *Hansard*, June 9, 1871, p. 1761.

³ *Ibid.* p. 1768.

The principle of the proposed bill was thus affirmed, but the session was too far advanced to admit of its being sent to the Commons, and again there was a year's postponement.

In February 1872 Lord Shaftesbury, for the fourth time, introduced his measure, dividing it now, for convenience, into two separate bills. The first and more important of these, which dealt with the structure of the new Courts, was now at last carried through the House of Lords, and although at the close of the session it was crowded out from the House of Commons, it gave occasion, on the last day of July, to a long and interesting debate, Mr. Gladstone among others expressing, amid loud cheers, his emphatic opinion "that there was an urgent case for legislation."¹

It will thus be seen that year by year the conviction had grown upon the authorities, both lay and clerical, that legislation with reference to the Ecclesiastical Courts was absolutely necessary, and could no longer be postponed. In three successive sessions Lord Shaftesbury's bill had obtained a second reading in the House of Lords. The Episcopal measure which followed two years afterwards—the mis-named Public Worship Regulation Act—is still not unfrequently denounced as having been sprung upon the Church as a surprise. A future chapter must describe its history and the wrath which it not unnaturally awakened. But whatever else may with truth be said against it, it seems impossible that to men whose eyes and ears were open the bill of 1874 can, in any reasonable sense, have come as a surprise.

The difficulty of considering the question dispassionately was, of course, enhanced by the mixing together of two independent subjects which have no necessary con-

¹ *Hansard*, July 31, 1872, p. 139.

nection with one another—the reform of Ecclesiastical Courts and the discouragement or suppression of unauthorised Ritual. Many who were pressing for some simpler and cheaper form of ecclesiastical suits did so with the sole wish of giving ‘a short shrift’ to the Ritualist defendants, and it was not wonderful that High Churchmen, who themselves desired to see some cure prescribed for the cumbrous inefficiency of the Courts, should look suspiciously upon prescriptions which came to them from Lord Shaftesbury.

The ‘anti-Ritualist’ movement was gathering both strength and volume, and on May 5, 1873, a deputation representing no less than 60,000 persons presented a Memorial to the two Archbishops at Lambeth, in favour of “the entire suppression of ceremonies and practices adjudged to be illegal.”

The Archbishops listened to the speeches of the deputation, and after a few weeks’ delay returned the following reply:—

*The Archbishops of Canterbury and York to the Chairman
of the Church Association.*

“ LAMBETH PALACE, *June 16, 1873.*

“ DEAR SIR,—We have carefully considered the Memorial which you presented to us at Lambeth early in last month, and to which upwards of 60,000 signatures were appended.

“ . . . There can be no doubt that the danger you apprehend of a considerable minority both of clergy and laity among us desiring to subvert the principles of the Reformation is real, and it is not unnatural that you should appeal to us for counsel and support.

“ . . . In your Memorial you ask us, first, whether we are ready ‘to exercise all the authority vested in us for the entire suppression of ceremonies and practices adjudged to be illegal, and, in the event of that authority proving insufficient, to afford all other needful facilities for the due enforcement of the w

We answer that we can have no doubt that it is our bounden duty to use our best endeavours to see that the law is obeyed, and to afford all needful facilities for its enforcement, when we are duly called upon so to do.

“ . . . While, however, we return these answers, we desire that there shall be no misapprehension as to our meaning, and we wish to state to you that we do not consider it to be the duty of the bishops to undertake judicial proceedings upon every complaint of a violation of the rubrics or upon every charge of unsound doctrine that may be laid before them ; obviously it cannot be desirable that the Church should be harassed by the bishops being dragged into an unlimited number of judicial investigations founded upon charges and counter-charges made by contending theological parties against their opponents, on the ground of alleged excess or defect in conforming to the ritual and preaching the doctrine of the Church. Episcopal government exists amongst us, charged with the grave responsibility of seeing that the undoubted law of the Church is observed, and, at the same time, of saving the Church, by the exercise of a wise discretion, from being plunged into endless unseemly contests. It will be generally admitted by Churchmen that a prosecution respecting doctrine or ritual is in itself an evil, even where it is necessary, and the bishops are bound in each case to consider the whole of the circumstances before they resort to their courts to procure obedience to the law.

“ . . . We cannot conclude without expressing to you our conviction that, however much may be effected by the legitimate exercise of authority, still in a Protestant Church like ours it is by kindly personal influence in our several families and neighbourhoods, by sound arguments, and appeals to the loyalty of those who are in danger of falling into error, rather than by judicial acts of authoritative interference, that the tendencies of which you justly complain can be met.

“ . . . We rejoice to trace many hopeful signs in the Church of which we are ministers, and to note an increase of religious life in the whole nation. We are not surprised that amongst ourselves, as in the other religious bodies, zeal should in many instances be indiscreet, and the doctrines and customs of pure Christianity be liable to be forgotten amidst the din of controversy ; but we think we have good reason to be hopeful for the future, from the remembrance of the history of the past, and

knowing how public opinion in Churches as in States ebbs and flows, and how God directs all for the accomplishment of His holy purposes, we assure you that, in the midst of many difficulties, we look forward hopefully both for our own Church and all other Christian communions, knowing that God, if we faithfully serve Him, is ready to defend His truth against superstition, against infidelity, and against worldliness.—We remain, dear Sir, your faithful servants,

“A. C. CANTUAR.

“W. EBOR.”

In the year 1873 a change which the Archbishop regarded as of first-rate importance was effected, in spite of his strenuous protest, in the constitution of the Court of Final Appeal in Causes Ecclesiastical.

The great Judicature Bill, materially altering the whole system of the English Courts of Law, was carried successfully through Parliament under the guidance of Lord Chancellor Selborne. The bill as introduced into the House of Lords did not propose any change in the constitution of the Court of Final Appeal in Causes Ecclesiastical. But it had long been the wish of Bishop Wilberforce, Mr. Gladstone, and others, that the Final Court should, by the exclusion of the Episcopal members who belonged to it, be deprived of its quasi-Ecclesiastical character. Vigorous but ineffectual efforts had been made to that end in the year 1861,¹ and they were now resumed. The subject was one in the discussion of which the Archbishop had long been prominent. Eight years before (in January 1865) he had contributed a careful historical preface to a volume in which were collected all the judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in ecclesiastical cases,² and in his Charge of the

¹ See *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, vol. iii. p. 102, etc.

² The authors of the volume were the Hon. G. C. Brodrick and the Rev. W. H. Fremantle, the latter being at the time one of Bishop Tait's chaplains.

following year he had again dealt with the subject at great length, defending on historical and practical grounds the mixed constitution of the Court. To this position he still strenuously adhered.

On May 5, 1873, during the progress of the bill through the House of Lords, Lord Salisbury moved an amendment to the effect that appeals from the Ecclesiastical Courts should be heard, like any other appeals, by the lay judges and no others. He was supported by Bishop Wilberforce, who "did not think that judgments in Ecclesiastical causes by persons having seats on the Episcopal Bench were likely to be as just, or, if they were, to appear to be as just, as those pronounced by Judges who were not ecclesiastical persons."¹

The Archbishop spoke very fully against the change:—

"The noble Marquis," he said, "objected to the composition of the Judicial Committee on the ground that the Bishops who had seats on it were unlearned, and that they were partial. It was true that in one sense they might be said to be unlearned; but if matters of Ecclesiastical Discipline coming before the Judicial Committee involved questions of theology and of great intricacy, was it possible that they could administer the law without any knowledge of theology? . . . He was not going to reveal the secrets of the Judicial Committee, but he was going to make an assertion which would be found correct when the secrets of that Committee came to be known. . . . Some noble and learned lords, who in their legal capacity might be the ablest men in the kingdom, might still from their ignorance of theological terms so express themselves upon a theological point that this might be the result—that one decision might have excluded the whole High Church Party, another might have excluded the Low Church Party, and a third the Broad Church Party. At the least, then, ecclesiastical members might be of use in guiding the language used in decisions of the most learned members of the legal profession. In the various cases with which he had had to do he had always found the greatest willingness on the part

¹ See *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, vol. iii. p. 102, etc.

of noble and learned lords to consult the ecclesiastical members on the matters in which they could really be of use. It had been not uncommon to request the ecclesiastical members to draw up their opinion, to distribute it among all the members, and to pay the utmost deference to the advice of the ecclesiastical members in the final judgment. . . . The history of the process for dealing with ecclesiastical causes went back a very long way indeed, and he maintained that the mixed tribunal which at present sat in these cases represented the deliberate judgment of the Church of England in every stage in which it had existed since the Reformation. The old Court of Delegates consisted partly of ecclesiastics and partly of laymen. . . . He was astonished that in the quarter where it might least have been expected, there seemed to have been a sudden conversion to the opinion that all ecclesiastical matters ought to be submitted to a purely lay tribunal. . . . There were many now advocating the subjugation of the whole ecclesiastical jurisprudence of the country to laymen, who a short time ago were all in favour of there being none but Ecclesiastical Judges in these Courts, and he could not help thinking there was 'something at the bottom of it.' . . . He believed that, in all periods of the history of the Church, these tribunals had been mixed, and his advice was that in these things we should not rashly change our old institutions."¹

The Archbishop's arguments prevailed, and the amendment was withdrawn. But two months later, when the bill was in Committee in the Commons, the rejected amendment reappeared, after only a few hours' notice, on the motion of Mr. Gathorne Hardy. It was supported from opposite sides of the House, and on opposite grounds, and Mr. Gladstone, on behalf of the Government, accepted it. This sudden proposal in the House of Commons seems to have been suggested the day before by Bishop Wilberforce,² but the Archbishop heard nothing of it until a letter arrived from Mr. Gladstone the same evening announcing that the change had been made. He

¹ *Hansard*, 5th May 1873, p. 1468, etc.

² *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, vol. iii. p. 417.

wrote at once to Mr. Disraeli, Mr. Hardy, and, of course, to the Prime Minister. Mr. Disraeli replied—

“The affair is astounding. I thought of course that Mr. Hardy was in communication with your Grace. It is difficult to write about these matters, but I would endeavour to attend any appointment you might make.”

To Mr. Hardy the Archbishop wrote :—

“To alter the constitution of the Church, as it has come down to us from the Reformation, without any consultation with the heads of the Church, and after the protest raised against the proposed measure in the House of Lords by the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London, is a very serious matter. I doubt whether any step so grave in the [direction] of disestablishment has yet been made, for if the amendment is adopted in its present state, an ecclesiastical cause involving the gravest purely ecclesiastical questions may be decided from its first to its last stage without any ecclesiastic having the power of giving his advice upon it, and this at a time when the race of ‘ecclesiastical lawyers’ so-called is, through recent legislation, fast dying out. I doubt whether such a state of things exists anywhere in Christendom. It is totally unheard of in the Church of England, either before or since the Reformation.”

In his letter to Mr. Gladstone he wrote :—

“It seems to me impossible to support the ‘Judicature Bill’ when it returns to the Lords if it makes so serious a change in the ancient constitution of the Church as seems to be contemplated. . . . I take it for granted that some at least of the amendments introduced in the Commons are intended to endanger the bill on its return to the Lords, and if it is to have our support I must look to you to secure that by some means the *principle* of the present arrangement shall not be given up, but that the Court of Appeal shall in ecclesiastical matters be advised by the presence of ecclesiastics.”

Further communications passed, and it was seen that many leading Churchmen outside Parliament were of the

Archbishop's opinion. When the bill came back from the Commons, the Lord Chancellor proposed a new amendment, for which he had already secured the Archbishop's support. By this clause it was provided that in accordance with arrangements to be made by the Queen in Council, the Court of Appeal should be advised by Bishops sitting not as judges but as assessors. The Archbishop, while reluctantly accepting this arrangement, spoke severely of the course which had been pursued by the advocates of the "exclusively lay tribunal."

"For himself," he said, "he had never been more surprised in his life than when he learnt that before dinner on a day in July a sudden change had been made in the bill, of such importance that a very eminent lawyer had declared in print that the introduction of that change altogether destroyed the Royal supremacy in the Church in this land. . . . He felt that in that matter they were almost in the condition of persons who were run off with in an express train, and did not know what in the world was to happen next. . . . On the evening in question he had received a letter from the Prime Minister, the language of which was, as it always was, courteous, but it informed him in plain English that the thing was done, and not only that, but, what surprised him still more, that the right hon. gentleman had consulted his colleagues in the Cabinet on the propriety of doing it the day before, although no communication whatever had passed between the heads of the Church and those who were engaged in quietly considering in the Cabinet whether the constitution of the Church should be altered or not. He did not know what was meant by 'consulting one's colleagues in the Cabinet,' but it was often said that when any Prime Minister had a specialty, the members of his Cabinet were more or less in the position of the *κωφὰ πρόσωπα* with which they were all familiar in the Greek drama. He was therefore much obliged to the noble and learned lord for having so far listened to the Episcopal Bench as at all events to have altered what appeared to be a total exclusion of the ecclesiastical element from the highest Court of Appeal in ecclesiastical causes. He was not unwilling to accept the modified proposal now made, because it

enabled them probably to get out of a great difficulty. . . . The highest Court of Appeal would be an Ecclesiastical Court still, for it would represent the Queen in her ecclesiastical capacity as exercising the supremacy of the crown.”¹

The new arrangement was accepted by the House and became in due course law. When the Court was again remodelled a few years later, the changes concerned the lay judges only, and in no way affected the principle for which the Archbishop had so strenuously contended.

The following somewhat disjointed extracts from the Diary of 1873 allude to points of interest, or to episodes which lie outside the narrative of his public life.

“ADDINGTON, *December 22, 1872*.—Yesterday my sixty-first birthday. ‘Surely goodness and mercy have followed me all the days of my life.’ Dear presents from my little girls and friends. We long to hear again from Craufurd. One letter we had this week from Cairo! The Lord be with the lad. His heart is evidently with us all at home.—What a long time to look back upon since I went to Oxford, long since I went to Rugby, long even since I went to London House. How full of mercies, as of trials, has each portion of my life been! Oh Lord, guide down the vale as the shades of evening close.”

“LAMBETH, *2nd Sunday in Lent, March 9, 1873*.—This week I have been very shaky, partly from cold. . . . On Monday I had hard work to sit through my business in the morning. At two I went to the Levee, and afterwards other engagements. The evening was spent with a great gathering of Lambeth tradesmen to confer on Sunday trading, and after entertaining them for two hours in the Guard Room and Picture Gallery, and addressing them at some length, I was fairly knocked up. Next morning, however, I was all right again, and received in the Guard Room a deputation from 4000 dissenting ministers eager to have the sanction of Parliament for marrying their deceased wives’ sisters. Old Binney was there, looking and speaking like a king of men, but ——— talked egregious nonsense, as did some of the others. I heard all they had to say and gave no answer.—Drove after-

¹ *Hansard*, July 24, 1873, pp. 872-4.

wards to Addington, a delicious spring evening, and enjoyed ourselves quietly till Friday, making up arrears of work and reading a good deal."

"*March 15, 1873.*—This week has been a time of tremendous excitement in London. Monday and Tuesday I spent in ordinary occupations. Preached a sermon on Wednesday on 'The Mind of Christ,' at S. Mary Woolnoth, to a most attentive congregation of city men. With Wednesday morning the political crash came, Gladstone's Government being in a minority of three on his Irish University Bill. Strange to say, we were engaged to dine with him that day, to meet the Duke of Edinburgh, etc., etc. . . . Joachim, the great violinist, dined to meet the notabilities, and there was a musical party afterwards, which Lord —, whom I met on the stairs, compared to 'fiddling while Rome was burning.' . . .

"Making progress with Delitzsch on Isaiah. Have read a novel, which has interested me by its descriptions of Jersey and Sark, *The Doctor's Dilemma*. To-day have read a good deal of Tulloch on *Rational Theology*. Hare's *Memorials of a Quiet Life* has a great interest for me, from setting forth the inevitable separations and trials in the midst of blessings, whereof I seem to have known so much. . . ."

"ADDINGTON, *12th May 1873.*—Last week was very heavy. I left early on Monday for Lambeth, to receive a deputation from 60,000 people thirsting for the blood of the Ritualists. There were 200 in the Guard Room. The papers contain the account of what passed.¹ I then hurried to head a deputation of S.P.G. at the Foreign Office, on the Madagascar Bishopric; and, lastly, had a very sharp debate in the Lords with Lord Salisbury on the Final Court of Appeal in matters ecclesiastical.

"*Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday* we had Convocation. The debates are recorded—one of them very important. On Thursday dined at London House. It was pleasant to see the old home looking so cheery. Afterwards to Convocation Party at Ely House. *Saturday.*—British Museum.

"LAMBETH, *Sunday, 25th May 1873.*—Yesterday morning brought the intelligence of the death of another dear friend—the Bishop of Argyll. He breathed his last on the evening of Ascension Day, after seven days and nights of mortal

¹ See p. 115.

agony. So little do we know what is going on except in our immediate presence, that I never heard of his illness, and was expecting to see him in London when the letter announcing his death arrived. We shall greatly miss him ; kindly jests, and the really spiritual tone which breathed through all his talk and letters. . . . Thus, three of my most attached friends—Ramsay Campbell, Archdeacon Sandford, and Bishop Ewing—gone since last autumn. We are gathering to the great meeting in Christ's presence. Lord, keep me during the time that remains ever near to Thee ! How various are God's ways of calling His servants ! The dear Bishop said, when racked with pain, ' Perhaps I suffer this because it is good for me, as I have led so hilarious a life.' Dear man, it was his humour that helped to sustain him in his many trials, and I never remember anything in his humour inconsistent with that deep devotional spirit which characterised all he said.

" Last Sunday, two excellent sermons from the Bishop of Lichfield and from Dr. Monsell. On Wednesday I settled the Madagascar Bishopric affair by a final letter to S.P.G. On Ascension Day I preached in Lambeth Church.

" Have been writing for the Archbishop of York our answer to the 60,000 who addressed us against Ritualists. Thus, very busy, besides innumerable letters every day. What should I do without such a secretary as Max ! "

CHAPTER XXII.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

1870-1873.

IN more than one of the controversies which marked the long episcopate of Archibald Tait it may, roughly speaking, be said that the clergy were ranged upon one side and the laity upon the other. It was not so, indeed, with the 'Essays and Reviews' dispute. It was not so with the strife about Bishop Colenso. Perhaps it was not markedly so with the Burials Bill. But it was so with the major part of the Ritual controversies of the time, and emphatically it was so with the long and painful disputations about the use of the Athanasian Creed.¹ That subject was of course no new one in the Church of England. It had disturbed many generations of Churchmen, from the Reformation downwards—from the earliest time, that is, at which the Creed in an English and therefore an intelligible form had been adopted for popular use in the Church's Liturgy. When Tillotson, in 1689, two years before his consecration to the Primacy, made an attempt, happily ineffectual, at an authoritative revision of the Prayer-Book, the difficulties of the Athanasian Creed formed a prominent subject of discussion, and an Explanatory Rubric was devised. Just a century later (in 1786) the proposed American Prayer-Book was sub-

¹ Earnest efforts were of course made to prove the contrary. But they were not triumphantly successful; and even the great gathering in St. James's Hall on January 31, 1873, made little impression upon the Church at large.

mitted to the English Bishops for approval. To some of the changes suggested in it our Bishops successfully demurred, but they seem to have sanctioned without scruple the excision of the Athanasian Creed.¹ It was not, perhaps, unnatural that they should do so, at a time when the disuse of the creed was frequent, or even general, at home. In the early years of the present century more than half the parishes in England, it is said, were unaccustomed to the creed. Bishop Blomfield, particular as he was, never used it in the first ten years of his ministry. In this, as in other directions, the 'Oxford Movement' wrought a sudden change. In easy-going parish churches, where for many generations the rubric had been practically forgotten or ignored, the congregations were now periodically startled by the unfamiliar words, and perhaps indignant when referred to the plain rubrical command in justification of their minister's 'new-fangled ways.' The subject began to be again discussed, and it was shown that the difficulties were not imaginary, and that where their pressure was felt it was usually by those members of a congregation who were neither careless nor unintelligent.

"For thirteen years of my ministerial life," said Bishop Fraser of Manchester, "I had charge of a rural parish of 200 souls. The one intelligent man in my congregation was the squire. Whenever I stood up to recite the Athanasian Creed in his presence he sat down at once, closing his Prayer-Book with an angry slam. And the pain this used to give me was poorly compensated by hearing the clerk and some fifty or sixty agricultural labourers reciting their alternate verses, from which I doubt if they received as much edification as they would have done from the more familiar language of the Apostles' Creed."²

¹ In the controversies of 1871-73 it was frequently asserted that the American Church was anxious to replace the Creed in her Prayer-Book, and it is therefore worth noting that no such change has been made in the American Prayer-Book as revised since then.

² *Life of Bishop Fraser*, p. 204.

It might be easy to answer such an argument, but the fact remained indisputable. Earnest members of ordinary congregations objected, reasonably or unreasonably, to reciting words which, as they said, they could not understand, and to expressing what appeared at least to be an awful judgment upon every holder of a different faith. Such was the first fact which had now to be faced; and the second—perhaps even more serious, and less easy to answer—was this: Candidates for holy orders found an increasing difficulty in subscribing their deliberate assent to a document, however venerable, of which the ‘damnatory clauses’ formed a part. Nor could the scruple be fairly regarded as the mere outcome of a flippant fear of dogma. The Cambridge remonstrants were described by the Professor of Divinity as comprising

“a large proportion of those who are foremost in all Church work, and who are looked to as likely to furnish the fittest and most efficient recruits to the ranks of the ministry, many among them being men of high academic distinction, filling positions of great trust in their respective colleges.”

Expression was thus given on two distinct grounds to a growing sense of uneasiness and a desire for relief; and when the Royal Commission was appointed, in 1867, “to inquire into the Rubrics and Ritual of the Church of England,”¹ the time for such relief seemed to have arrived. Some of the Royal Commissioners indeed doubted whether so large a matter could be brought within the terms of their instructions, nor did they even attempt to deal with it in any of their first three Reports. In preparing, however, their fourth and last Report, in the spring of 1870, they found themselves obliged to face the question, and after discussing four or five distinct proposals for the

¹ See vol. i. p. 409.

omission, curtailment, or re-translation of the creed, they arrived at last at an agreement—if so it could be called—that the creed should retain its place in the public service of the Church, but that a rubric should be appended to it, setting forth

“That the condemnations in this Confession of Faith are to be no otherwise understood than as a solemn warning of the peril of those who wilfully reject the Catholic Faith.”

Twenty-seven Commissioners signed the Report, which dealt with the rubrics as a whole and was not for the most part of a controversial character; but no less than seventeen of these appended their names to protests qualifying more or less extensively their adherence to the particular recommendation of their colleagues with regard to the Athanasian Creed.

Foremost among these protesters was Archbishop Tait. Unfortunately the discussions on this subject had all taken place during his illness. But the question was one to which he had long given his attention, and he had several times spoken upon it with no uncertain voice. His protest was as follows:—

“Respecting the Athanasian Creed.—While I rejoice that the Commissioners have thought it right to append a rubric explanatory of the sense in which ‘the condemnations in this Confession of Faith’ are to be understood, I cannot feel entirely satisfied with this course. . . . I should have deemed it a wiser course had the Commission decided that the creed in question, valuable and most important as are its doctrinal statements, should not retain its place in the Public Service of the Church.
A. C. CANTUAR.”

The Report, with these protests attached, was published in September 1870. In the following winter and spring, during the Archbishop's absence on the Continent, the discussion of the subject became general. It is often

a figure of speech to say that 'volumes' have been written upon some controversial point. In this case it is a literal matter of fact. Among the Archbishop's books there are, besides scores of pamphlets, eight separate volumes devoted to this single subject, all of them published between the years 1868 and 1872. His correspondence on the subject was very large, and revealed the reality of the difficulty felt by loyal and orthodox Churchmen. One such, a writer of wide influence and a leading man in his University, wrote as follows :—

"I believe that this Creed has done more to alienate the minds of intellectual men from the Church of England than all other causes. Men may earnestly, and, I believe, devoutly and profitably, join in a service the whole of which they may not heartily approve of, but it is a different thing to use words so awful as those employed in this creed when you are conscious that neither you nor the rest of the congregation believe them in their literal, and grammatical, and, as I conceive, original sense."

Such were the number, variety, and weight of the memorials received by the Archbishop on the subject,¹ that in a formal letter to the Bishop of London, written from San Remo on December 27, 1870, with reference to possible Church legislation, he spoke of "some amendment of the rubric regulating the use of the Athanasian Creed" as a matter "on which there seems to be an almost universal consent in the Church." But it was much easier to clamour for 'some action' than to say what it ought to be; and the Bishop of London, who was representing the Archbishop in his absence from England, decided to ask Mr. Gladstone to give legislative effect to other parts

Appended to the Memorial which asked that the use of the Creed might, at the least, be made optional, were such names as the following—Dean Champneys of Lichfield, Canon Walsham How (now Bishop of Wakefield), Canon Venables, Prebendary Erskine Clarke, Archdeacon Hles, and many more of a like sort.

of the Ritual Commissioners' elaborate Report, but to leave the Athanasian Creed alone, as a subject too thorny to meddle with. The moment he heard from the Bishop of this plan the Archbishop replied as follows:—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of London.

“MENTONE, *Jan. 14, 1871.*

“MY DEAR BISHOP,—As to the *vexata questio* of the Athanasian Creed. The proposal to omit any reference to this subject would, I am sure, be of no avail in preventing a discussion upon it in Parliament; for I am certain that if this point is not included in the Government Bill there are members in the House of Lords, and still more in the House of Commons, who will not fail to propose an addition to the Bill recommending that the Athanasian Creed be no longer read in our public Church service. And considering what I know of the opinions and feelings of Churchmen on this question, and the encouragement which these feelings have publicly received from myself (and I believe also from the Archbishop of York), as well as from the almost unanimous proposal of the Ritual Commission to make some alteration respecting the use of this creed, I cannot doubt that the addition would be carried in Parliament, and I myself, as at present advised, could not but support such an addition. It remains, therefore, for the Government to consider whether it would not be more advisable to embody in the original Bill what will, as I believe, be inevitably introduced in its passage through Parliament.

“It would be urged in Parliament, and with great force, that it will never do to have yearly alterations in the Prayer-Book, and that, therefore, this question of the Athanasian Creed, like the others, ought to be settled once for all, as I believe almost all thoughtful Churchmen are agreed that sooner or later the matter must be dealt with.—Ever yours, A. C. CANTUAR.”

It was decided, after further correspondence, that the Government Bill should, for that year, be limited to the authorisation of the new Lectionary, and that all other questions should be postponed until the Archbishop's return to England. Early in June he was again at

Lambeth, and found men's minds greatly exercised upon the subject, although their unanimity, as has been said, went no further than a wish that a question so disquieting might, if possible, be set at rest at once. Even those who were satisfied with the plan of appending an 'explanatory rubric' were widely sundered in their view of what the explanation ought to be, and meanwhile the average layman, in Parliament or elsewhere, was impatiently fretting at what he considered the pedantic and intractable bigotry of the clergy in not consenting at once to sweep away, 'bag and baggage,' from the Church's Order of Service a document which was described as "the barbarous production of a barbarous age," and "a form of words conveying no idea whatever to the mind."¹ Lord Stanhope and Lord Grey in the House of Lords, and Mr. Chambers and many others in the House of Commons, gave forcible expression to such a view as this, and it was only at the earnest solicitation of the Archbishop that Mr. Chambers refrained from taking a vote of the House of Commons on the subject in connection with the 'Lectionary Bill' then passing through the House.

The Archbishop saw that no such rough and ready treatment of the question could possibly be accepted by the Church, and a few weeks after his return to England he summoned a meeting of Bishops at Lambeth to consider the best policy to be pursued. There were now at least seven alternative courses definitely proposed—(1) The creed might be excluded altogether from the public service of the Church, and relegated to a position similar to that of the thirty-nine articles at the end of the Prayer-Book; (2) Its use might be rendered optional, not compulsory;

¹ See Earl Grey's speech in House of Lords on March 13, 1871. *Hansard*, p. 1863.

(3) It might be read once a year, say on Trinity Sunday ; (4) When used it might be sung, according to ancient custom, as a canticle introductory to the Apostles' Creed, and not substituted for that creed ; (5) The 'damnatory clauses,' which formed its principal offence, might be omitted as no part of the actual creed ; (6) It might be so retranslated as to give less offence to the unlearned ; (7) It might retain its place with the accompaniment or appendage of a rubric to explain (some said to explain away) its meaning.

The Archbishop had made no secret of his own preference for the first and boldest of these many plans. But he was personally willing, should sufficient cause be shown, to accept any of the other six. Each proposal found its advocates at the Bishops' meeting held on July 8 ; but it was finally decided to postpone public action for a few months at least, and that in the meantime a committee of Bishops should revise the translation of the creed, with the co-operation of the Divinity Professors of the two great Universities.

The University experts, however, were ranged in opposite camps, the Cambridge authorities, Professors Lightfoot, Swainson, Westcott, and Selwyn¹ being in favour of the disuse of the creed, or, at the least, of its damnatory clauses, while the Oxford Professors, six in number,² had hitherto been regarded as the most uncompromising opponents of any change whatever. A few months before, they had all of them appended their names to a largely-signed memorial promoted by Dr. Pusey—a document which deliberately refrained from

¹ The first three signed an elaborate document setting out their view. The document is published in full in the *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1872, p. 49. Canon Selwyn withheld his signature for further consideration, but afterwards expressed his concurrence with his colleagues. *Ib.* p. 379.

² Professors Pusey, Ogilvie, Heurtley, Bright, Liddon, and Mozley.

recommending the insertion of an explanatory rubric,¹ and besought the Archbishop, "in the interests of the future cohesion of the Church of England . . . not to sanction any tampering" with the creed.

The knowledge of the strenuous opposition likely to be offered to any of the suggested changes by men exercising so deservedly wide an influence had immensely aggravated the difficulty of the question, and it was therefore an agreeable surprise to the Archbishop to learn from Dr. Pusey that they were now prepared with an 'explanatory rubric' of their own, as the outcome of certain letters which had passed between the Episcopal Committee and themselves.

This new departure was communicated to the Archbishop in the following letter :—

The Rev. Dr. Pusey to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD, Dec. (7 2), 1871.

"MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,— . . . After long consultation, we [the Professors] have sent this evening our answer to the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, which we all signed. Your Grace will be kindly interested in seeing the explanatory note in which we finally concurred. The prevailing feeling was that it had better be very short, so several were withdrawn. That adopted by us is very simple.

"*Note.*—That nothing in this creed is to be understood as condemning those who by involuntary ignorance or invincible prejudice are hindered from accepting the faith therein declared.'

"Dr. Bright told us of a dictum of your Grace which he had treasured up from his Rugby days, 'That a person cannot hold what he has not received,' or to this effect. I think that this explanation removes all objections by exempting all except culpable rejection of the known mind of God, and it is, I suppose, even greater contempt of God wilfully to reject what He

¹ On the ground that "every well-instructed Christian" understands the limited application of the damnatory clauses.

declares to us than to do what He forbids us. For it is more deliberate rejection. Anyhow it does not say any more than our Lord, S. John, xii. 48.—I remain your Grace's faithful and humble servant.

E. B. PUSEY."

On receiving this letter the Archbishop immediately took counsel with a few trusted friends as to the new proposal. But he found the suggested 'note' to be anything but palatable even to the most temperate and accommodating among the advocates of a change, while it was certain the words would be unhesitatingly scouted by the extremer men, whether lay or clerical. One of his advisers, foremost perhaps for ripe learning and calm judgment, Dr. Lightfoot, afterwards Bishop of Durham, wrote :—

"My objection to the Oxford alternative is that it sanctions a mode of interpretation which, if applied to other parts of the creeds, would sap the foundations of all religious profession. . . . I am much dismayed at the prospect of leaving matters as they are, . . . and though the Oxford rubric seems to me quite the most objectionable solution, yet it might be better than nothing. But I could not make myself actively responsible for such a step, because I have a grave misgiving of the moral consequences."

Among those with whom the Archbishop now communicated was Mr. Gladstone, to whom he sent Dr. Pusey's "hopeful-looking" letter. The Prime Minister's reply was not a very encouraging one :—

"I shall be very glad, though not on my own personal account, if Dr. Pusey's letter open the way to any proceeding in relation to the Athanasian Creed which may have the effect of allaying scruples. When your Grace's materials are further prepared I shall be most happy to consult with you, and to take the opinion of the Cabinet, if need be, on the introduction of any Bill. . . . I am very fearful of the breaking down of the dyke which stands between us and confusion as to legislation affecting the Church. . . ."

Such was the situation—difficult and complex in the extreme—when the Bishops for the second time met in consultation on December 5, 1871. The revisers of the translation reported the progress of their work; the advocates of a ‘thorough-going’ policy urged the removal of the rubric directing the use of the Creed; the opponents of all change prophesied the speedy disappearance of the controversy if the Bishops would only resolve to do nothing. On the other hand, quite a sheaf of ‘explanatory rubrics’ was handed in for consideration, and the Archbishop, finding how few of his brethren supported the line he had himself maintained, expressed his readiness to agree, should it become absolutely necessary, to a mere ‘explanatory rubric,’ even if its form should have to be that which he liked least of all—the clause drawn up by the Oxford Professors. To this course the Bishops in the end agreed, “subject to future consideration of its necessity,” and the Archbishop at once issued a formal notice¹ that he would “take the opinion of Convocation on the earliest possible day after their assembling . . . on the expediency of adopting the recommendations of the Fourth Report of the Ritual Commissioners, with this exception, that a slightly altered form of explanatory note will be proposed in place of that recommended by the Ritual Commissioners in the rubric respecting the Athanasian Creed.”

Indignation immediately blazed forth from those who had hitherto been the Archbishop’s chief supporters. They charged him with “an unwonted and unhappy cowardice” in not insisting absolutely on the banishment of the Creed from Divine Service. Bishop Thirlwall, of St. David’s, in a letter of some warmth, declined henceforward to attend any more meetings on the subject.

¹ See *Guardian* of December 27, 1871.

"I can only," he added, "look forward with great concern to the course of proceeding which has been decided upon, which I am persuaded will do much damage to the Church, as it must widen the breach between the clergy and the most intelligent and educated of the lay members of her Communion. Even before the Creed had been exposed to the light in which it has been placed by Mr. Ffoulkes as a wicked forgery, one of your Grace's predecessors, who only saw in it an unchristian attempt to impose metaphysical subtleties by impious threats, wished that we were well rid of it. How earnestly would he have repeated that wish when better informed as to its true character. Yet this is the juncture when it is to be reaffirmed by the vote of a clerical Convocation. . . .—Yours faithfully,

"C. ST. DAVID'S."

The Archbishop replied, urging quieter counsels, and hoping that the Bishop would not withdraw himself from discussions in which "the absence of one whose name and advice are so powerful would be greatly felt."

"Though I am of opinion," he added, "that it is well to lay the explanatory rubric before Convocation, I feel no confidence that such a rubric will be adopted. . . . The result is quite uncertain; but it is of deep importance that the question should be thoroughly sifted. No doubt it is very difficult to prevent violent partisans of Dr. Pusey and Dr. Liddon from being only strengthened in their resistance by any strong statements that are made upon the other side; but I feel that without your presence and advice in this somewhat difficult time we must halt in our gait."¹

Dean Stanley wrote with even greater vehemence, and the Archbishop found himself, as so often before, placed between two fires.

The subject was one on which party feeling ran high, and the conditions of the controversy had not hitherto been favourable to a calm decision. The war had been one of books, and pamphlets, and newspaper correspon-

¹ The Bishop yielded to this appeal, and attended the February Session of Convocation, see p. 140.

dence, and partisan meetings, but no opportunity had yet been given for a calm debate which should enable the eager disputant upon either side to learn the answer given by his opponents to the particular difficulties which seemed to him most formidable. Such an opportunity the Archbishop was now bent upon securing, at least as much for the advantage of Churchmen outside as of the actual disputants in Convocation or elsewhere. Could the issue only be kept clear of complications from without, he believed that a discussion would be of unmixed advantage. But it was not to be thus kept clear, as the following letters show :—

Canon Liddon to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

" 3 AMEN COURT, Dec. 23, 1871.

" MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—As I gather from a letter signed 'Anglicanus,' in to-day's *Times*, that the attacks recently made on the Athanasian Creed are likely to be renewed at no distant date, it is not, I trust, obtrusive or other than right in me to state formally to your Grace, that if this most precious creed is either mutilated by the excision of the (so-termed) damnatory clauses, or degraded, by an alteration of the rubric which precedes it, from its present position in the Book of Common Prayer, I shall feel bound in conscience to resign my preferments, and to retire from the ministry of the Church of England. If I should unhappily be driven to this by the action of the English Bishops, it will become a duty, perhaps, to justify my step at some length, and to point out the wound and insult to *fundamental* truth, which, as I conceive, would be inflicted by either of the changes referred to. For the present, it is enough to say that having subscribed the statement that this creed, in its integrity, 'ought thoroughly to be received and believed, since it may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture,' I cannot passively acquiesce in any measure the avowed object of which is to deny the proposition thus affirmed in the eighth Article of our Church.—I am, my Lord Archbishop, your Grace's very faithful servant,

" H. P. LIDDON."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Canon Liddon.

"ADDINGTON, 26th Dec. 1871.

"MY DEAR DR. LIDDON,—I have been grieved and somewhat surprised to receive your letter of the 23d inst.

"It is scarcely a fortnight since I was empowered to state to a very full meeting of the Bishops that you, in conjunction with all the Professors of the theological faculty at Oxford, concurred in recommending a rubric to be appended to the Athanasian Creed, whereby a most important explanation is affixed to the so-called damnatory clauses. It is the opinion of some that this rubric sanctioned by you has virtually the effect of cancelling those clauses, and many think that it would be a more consistent course to omit the clauses in question, rather than to explain them in the manner proposed. I have myself, however, been quite willing to acquiesce in the very important change, to the recommendation of which you have appended your name, and I have persuaded the Bishops to agree to its being brought before Convocation for consideration. You are aware that we have had before us what I take to be a counter-proposal from those of the Cambridge theological Professors who maintain, as I understand them, that the present English version of the Athanasian Creed is of no value, as being an erroneous translation, and taken from corrupt manuscripts. Now of course the opinion of the Cambridge Professors is entitled to as much weight as that of the Professors of Oxford; and I should have been surprised to have received from any of them, at this stage of an investigation in which we are all equally interested, an intimation that, unless their own particular view was complied with, they must retire from the ministry of the Church of England. You will pardon me for saying that I think such a threat ought not to be held out in the midst of a calm discussion on a very difficult question amongst learned and attached members of the Church of England, when the results of such discussion are on the point of being submitted to the consideration of the provincial Synods of our Church. I would fain hope that I have mistaken the purport of your letter, and that by the words 'mutilation' or 'degradation' of the creed, you refer to something which none of us contemplates, and not to the reverent and reasonable modes of solving existing difficulties which the Ritual Commission and the Bishops have had before them.

"I gather from your assenting to the proposed change of the rubric that you are aware how deep is the uneasiness caused to many of the most orthodox and attached members of the Church of England by the use in public worship of the creed as it now stands, without any explanation; and how strong is the feeling that some explanation is required to vindicate the Catholic position of our Church, and save it from the imputation of calling upon all its members to deny the possibility of salvation to the members of the 'orthodox' Eastern Churches. I presume, therefore, that you grant that there is a difficulty, to which the rulers of the Church and its constituted synods are bound to direct their attention; and I will not believe, till I have further evidence, that on mature reflection you have resolved to interpose the fresh obstacle which your letter seems—and, I trust, only seems—to raise in the way of a wise settlement of what has long been a great difficulty to pious minds, both among the learned and unlearned.—Believe me to be very truly yours,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

Further letters followed, Canon Liddon explaining his meaning in more detail:—

"By the 'mutilation' of the creed I meant the omission of any one of its existing clauses. By the 'degradation' of the creed from its present place in our Prayer-Book I meant (1) The rendering its use only permissive; or (2) a reduction of the number of days on which it is now appointed to be used; or (3) still more, its removal from the public Service of the Church, and relegation to a place among the Thirty-nine Articles."

And again—

"The destructive energy of the unbelieving school will not stop with the creeds, as your Grace's knowledge of the existing condition of controversy with respect to the books of Holy Scripture would assure you. Would that it might not be reserved for your Grace's Primacy to 'give the tiger'—as far as our poor English Church is concerned—'his first taste of blood'! For myself, I fear I must say very respectfully, but firmly, that I adhere entirely to the terms of my first letter to your Grace."

In a final letter, dated January 3, 1872, he added what was even more important:—

"Dr. Pusey writes to me this morning that he entirely agrees in the resolution which I have submitted to your Grace. In case the Athanasian Creed should be degraded or mutilated in the ways specified, he too will resign his canonry, and retire from the ministry."¹

When it is remembered that this threat of resignation applied even to a rearrangement of the days on which the creed was compulsorily to be used, it will be seen how greatly the difficulties of calmly considering the subject had been thereby aggravated.

Convocation met on February 7, and the discussion in the Upper House was precisely of the character which the Archbishop had desired. Four great speeches by the Bishops of Lincoln, St. David's, Gloucester and Bristol, and Peterborough, presented the whole case from various points of view with masterly clearness, and with all the weight of intellectual power, ripe scholarship, and stirring eloquence. They were speeches calculated, if time were given, to inform and guide the opinion of Churchmen generally,² and it was felt how happy was the Archbishop's arrangement of business, whereby, with general consent, the necessary discussions in the Lower House were postponed until the April group of Sessions, that House occupying itself in the meantime with other important rubrics, about which there had been less heated controversy. But before adjourning the debates, the Archbishop took occasion to express his own view of the question, and as one, at least, of his sentences became a text for much subsequent criticism, it may be well to quote briefly from his speech. The Bishops of Gloucester and of Peter-

¹ See below, p. 150.

² In the course of the debate the venerable Bishop of Llandaff referred to "the momentous consequences which may result from the present discussion, a discussion, perhaps, more important than any which has taken place in Convocation for 200 years."—*Chronicle of Convocation*, Feb. 9, 1872, p. 99.

borough had urged "That it is not desirable to invite legislation" on the subject, the former pleading for the delay of another year, during which the retranslation and history of the creed might be still more exhaustively considered, the latter objecting in eloquent and telling words to the proposal for an 'explanatory rubric,' as calculated to do more harm than good :—

"I have deep reasons," said Bishop Magee, "for objecting to attach any explanatory rubric to the creed. The real truth of the matter is, that the words we seek to explain require no explanatory rubric at all. The words of the damnatory clauses are expressed with a clearness and precision which grate upon the consciences of men. They are drawn up with all the care and precision of criminal indictments, and infix themselves upon the minds of those who use them. Surely, if there be a sentence or sentences in the creed distinct, precise, and easily intelligible, it is these damnatory clauses—'*Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.*' Much in this creed is mysterious. I am not one who thinks that mysterious statements ought not to be put forward for reception by the laity ; on the contrary, I think it good that parts of a man's belief should be higher than his knowledge ; but in this creed the most easily intelligible part is that which seems to nine men out of ten to assert the eternal damnation of those who disbelieve. Now, if you have words which are in themselves clear and simple, making a particular statement or assertion, it is simply impossible, in the nature of things, that you can, by the mere exercise of your will, put a gloss upon those words to explain away their meaning. Words mean what logic and grammar make them to mean. You may debate as much as you please before you issue a document what the words composing it shall be ; but when you have put it out, you have not any right to say these words shall mean this or that : they pass under the dominion of grammar, and must mean what they say. No man has a right to say that they mean anything more or less than their grammatical construction implies and declares."

To this speech the Archbishop replied before closing,

or rather adjourning, the debate. He excused himself from the task of reiterating the personal opinion to which he had so often given expression, in favour of the disuse of the creed in public service, and set himself rather to defend his second or alternative course, the explanatory rubric:—

“I think, my Lords, we are not wasting time, because the general view of the question, which necessarily precedes the discussion in detail, will be cleared by such remarks as we have listened to. . . . I agree with the Bishop of Peterborough that it is not desirable there should be a discussion on the subject in either House of Parliament without guidance from ourselves, and I am disposed to think that the best way of avoiding undesirable discussion of the question is that we should do that which seems to me the proper office of Bishops of the Church of England—namely, take the matter into our own hands. . . . As to responsibility, what in the world are we here for, except to take responsibility on ourselves? and the more serious the responsibility is, the more we are bound to bear it. . . . The Bishop of Peterborough has thrown ridicule on explanatory rubrics, but the question is whether a public declaration of what we mean, or a private mental reservation of what we mean, is the best thing. I will not enter into argument with so great a master of dialectics: but he says every clause is to be taken in the absolute literal sense, and that of all the words of the creed none are so explicit as the damnatory clauses. Very well. We are to take them, then, in the plainest and most literal sense. But we do not. There is not a soul in the room who does. Nobody in the Church of England takes them in their plain and literal sense. Therefore, it would seem, they are to be explained either privately or publicly. . . . And I gather that the Bishop of Peterborough wants no explanatory rubric, because he wishes to remove these clauses out of the creed; and the speech which he has made in defence of not moving is grounded upon this: . . . that [these clauses are] to be explained away, but that the explanation is not to be made public. . . . His argument is that you should refrain from moving, because the creed should be altered as speedily as possible. . . .

“Then my right reverend brother, the Bishop of Gloucester,

reads us an improved version of the creed. I dare say it is an improved version, but it would be very difficult, I think, to persuade the public that, because this is not the exact creed, therefore you are, in the meantime, to go on reading it. . . .

"I press your Lordships to consider whether it is desirable that anything should go out from us which seems to say that we deprecate legislation, and deprecate the subject being now considered. . . . Let us look at the present state of things in the Church of England. . . . We here present have all used the formulary for fifty years, and it is to us personally a matter of very little importance whether a change is made by an explanatory rubric, or in any other way; but there are many young men, persons of ardent minds, who are labouring under difficulties regarding it, and it is for their sake that we are bound to give the question consideration."¹

The debate was adjourned, but its speeches were not soon forgotten. The Archbishop's words about the non-acceptance of the damnatory clauses in their literal sense, were periodically brought up against him to the end of his life. He was described as having "justified with his own lips the worst accusations of infidelity which had ever been brought against him"; as having "expressed his deliberate contempt for the faith of the Church Catholic"; and as having "publicly stepped over to the side of the Socinian and the infidel." "But we ought to be thankful," it was said, "that people using masks begin to drop them, grievous scandal as it is that the chief *custos* of the Christian faith in our land" should be led by his "Presbyterian or Erastian proclivities" to make the "humiliating avowal." A petition was prepared, and sent to Convocation, in which 315 clergymen charged the Archbishop with "impugning the truth and honesty of the clergy," and 'bringing Christianity into contempt.' They added that they had themselves "never recited the words with any

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, February 9, 1872, pp. 94, etc.

mental reservation, but had always understood them in their plain and literal sense.”¹

But the Archbishop refused, both then and afterwards, to retract what he had said, maintaining to the end that while his meaning might easily be misrepresented, it could not easily be misunderstood. In a published letter to the Bishop of Lincoln,² who had written to him in grave distress on the subject, he said—

“I had, you may remember, alluded to the explanation of the clauses in question advocated by Dr. Pusey, Dr. Heurtley, Dr. Ogilvie, Dr. Liddon, Canon Bright, and, I believe, Canon Mozley, which seemed to me to represent the opinion of a very large body of the clergy of the Church of England; and I expressed my belief that every member of the Church of England adopted some such modification of the literal meaning of the clauses in question as these eminent divines advocated, and that no one took them in the sense which they would bear if explained without such qualifications. . . . I am confident that it is only in a modified sense, with such qualifications as you allude to, that these clauses of the creed are retained by the Church; and though I see no inconsistency in subscribing the words with such acknowledged qualification, I still feel that it is in itself an evil to use words which require such explanation. If these clauses remain, they will always be used with such qualifications as you have alluded to, whether an explanatory rubric, distinctly stating the qualifications, be adopted by the Church or not.—Believe me, yours sincerely,
A. C. CANTUAR.”

In the last week of April the Lower House of Convocation met for the discussion of the question, and the debates were very different in character from those in the Upper House, to which allusion has been already made. Although the Archbishop had never mentioned it, Dr. Liddon's threatened resignation was no longer a secret, and the knowledge had raised to fever-heat the feeling both of

¹ See *Chronicle of Convocation*, April 30, 1872, p. 459.

² *Times*, April 15, 1872.

his partisans and of his opponents. Not often, in their long history, have the Jerusalem Chamber and its surroundings been the scene of stormier debate.

Dean Stanley threw himself with all his might into the fray on the one side, and Archdeacon Denison on the other, and the latter, at all events, found no lack of supporters in the House. So indignant did these protagonists become, that on one occasion the Archdeacon rushed from the House rather than listen longer to the Dean's denunciation of the damnatory clauses as containing "falsehood of the most misleading and dangerous kind." Needless to say, the Dean scorned the very notion of an 'explanatory rubric'—"a miserable attempt to explain away simple and emphatic words."

"I even admire these clauses," he continued, "for their magnificent perspicuity of language. Whoever was the author, he knew what he meant. He meant, as the Emperor Charlemagne meant, that any one who could not accept those words was everlastingly lost, and should be destroyed by sword and fire from the face of Christendom. I admire the Emperor Charlemagne, but I cannot admire those who come with these modern explanations to draw out the teeth of this old lion, who sits there in his majesty, and defies any explanation to take out his fierce and savage fangs."¹

The Archdeacon and his followers were not a whit less fiery and uncompromising upon the other side. He thundered against all who had pleaded either for change or explanation:—

"I often wonder," he said, "as I walk about London, what will be found when the bodies of this generation come to be exhumed. There will be a wonderful amount of cartilage, but very little backbone."²

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, April 24, 1872, p. 359.

² *Ibid.* pp. 476, etc.

For his own part, he had no doubts or hesitation as to what he ought to do.

"I do not mean to give up a single atom on any one point. I want no translation. I want no note. I don't want to alter the place or the use of the creed, or to touch its substance.¹ . . . I don't want anything changed. I am quite fool enough to wish to do nothing in the matter, because I believe that if we do anything it will be the worse for us in the end.² . . . Whatever this House may do, or whatever Parliament may do, whatever any power or authority may do, I shall, so long as I am the minister of a parish church, read that creed exactly as I have always read it, just the same number of times as I have always read it, without one single alteration of language or form. I shall do this, and then leave other people to turn me out of my benefice if they can."³

Again and again during the long debates the spokesmen on one side or the other called attention to the danger that Dr. Pusey and Canon Liddon might fulfil their threat of resignation, and the allusion never failed to evoke a storm. And so, from day to day, the debate went on with undiminished warmth, and resolutions were by slow degrees arrived at, with the practical effect of declaring any and every change to be alike undesirable. The creed should be retained in its integrity: there should be no change in the rubric which governed its public use: and although the question of its retranslation might well be considered, there was neither room nor need for any sort of explanatory note.⁴ Such were the stern resolutions which obtained the majority of votes. But as the days wore on a certain uneasiness began to spread, and it became clear that decisions arrived at in so heated an atmosphere would carry little weight with the Church

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, April 24, 1872, p. 339.

² *Ibid.* 338.

³ *Ibid.* 343.

⁴ For the wording of the resolutions see *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1872, pp. 458, 463, 473, 496.

at large, or perhaps even with those members of the House who might in calmer hours review their votes. There was a sense therefore of general relief when it came to be known that the Archbishop had consented to the appointment of a large committee of both Houses, in order that the question in all its bearings might, in the coming winter, be reconsidered with the advantage of the new light shed upon it by these long debates. For there were not a few who had confessed to a change of opinion during the course of the discussion, and who wanted time for thought. The memorials signed by men of weight and experience had taken Convocation somewhat by surprise.

One petition, for example, declaring the creed to be "unsuitable for use in the public service of the church" was signed, among others by the following London clergy :—

Alfred Barry, Principal of King's College ;¹ Anthony W. Thorold, Vicar of St. Pancras ;² James Moorhouse, Vicar of Paddington ;³ James A. Hessey, Preacher of Gray's Inn ;⁴ John Edward Kempe, Rector of St. James's, Westminster ; W. G. Humphry, Vicar of St. Martin's in the Fields ; Sir E. Bayley, Vicar of St. John's, Paddington ; J. M. Nisbet, Rector of St. Giles ; Edward Capel Cure, Rector of Bloomsbury ; George Currey, Master of the Charterhouse ; and Daniel Moore, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Paddington.⁵

If Convocation was to sustain its claim to represent the clergy, it was simply impossible to make light of a memorial to which such names as these were appended,

¹ Bishop of Sydney, 1884.

² Bishop of Rochester, 1877 ; of Winchester, 1891.

³ Bishop of Melbourne, 1876 ; of Manchester, 1885.

⁴ Archdeacon of Middlesex, 1875.

⁵ See *Chronicle of Convocation*, February 8, 1872, p. 46.

and not a few who had voted with the majority in Convocation came to another mind before many months had passed.

The great committee thus appointed could not meet before December, and for the Archbishop as well as others the interim was full of work. It was the autumn of his quadrennial visitation of the Diocese, and his Charge—his Primary Charge as Archbishop—was an elaborate survey of most of the greater questions of the day. Some parts of it will be referred to in a later chapter. We have here only to do with his words about the Athanasian Creed.

After summarising the position of the controversy, he spoke as follows :—

“Now I beg you to remember that there are two questions—one, what is the best course in itself, and the other, what alteration is feasible under the circumstances. On the first of these questions most of the Bishops, I believe, have expressed their own opinion, in some public way, as to what they think best to be done. Certainly I have expressed mine in the most explicit manner, viz., that the best plan would be to remove the creed from the regular services of the Church, and to retain it in the articles ; for I hold that it is quite legitimate to declare, as we do in the articles, that the creed may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture, while we maintain that the creed itself is separable from the anathema which accidentally accompanies it.

“I trust we may arrive at a satisfactory conclusion respecting the second question. I believe I could myself acquiesce in any one of the suggested alterations, all of which I consider to be, on the whole, preferable to the existing state of things. But now I must state, though with much reluctance, that the greatest difficulty in the way arises from the unreasonable conduct of certain eminent persons, who declare that they will break the church in two if we adopt any other than their own particular way of settling this grave difficulty. Such conduct, I say, is deserving of our reprobation, and I trust that, after full consideration, those who are guilty of it will come to a better mind. All of us are anxious to maintain the great doctrine of the Trinity, and that there shall be reality in our declarations ; and

if we meet with a great difficulty, which has long pressed on the minds of earnest men, we have a right to seek the best advice, and to request these learned and devout members of the Church to assist us, and not to commence the discussion with an unwarrantable declaration that they are prepared to break the Church in two if the decision arrived at does not meet their own particular views. But, after all, I trust it may be possible to settle the matter. A very large committee of both Houses of Convocation of the province of Canterbury will soon meet, and endeavour to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. The Archbishop of York and myself have promised, to give our most serious consideration to the subject, and, if we can, we shall endeavour to relieve those who declare that they suffer under a grave difficulty. We shall consult, as we are bound, our brother Bishops and the clergy generally; our anxious desire being to modify the rule as to the use of this creed, if it can be done consistently with the maintenance of truth and of the peace of the Church.”¹

This Charge, as was to be expected, drew a strong reply from Dr. Pusey. His letter, which is too long to reproduce in full, seems to show that he was unaware of the terms in which Dr. Liddon had quoted him to the Archbishop some nine months before.²

Rev. Dr. Pusey to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“October (? 20), 1872.

“MY DEAR LORD,—In the report of your Grace’s recent Charge, it is stated that you animadverted severely upon some of the clergy of your Grace’s province, among whom I cannot but think that your Grace included myself. . . . So far as I know what has been said, publicly or privately, by any upon whom your Grace animadverts, it has been that, as far as human foresight extends, we believe that there *would be* a great rent *in* or *from* the Established Church if the Athanasian Creed shall be tampered with by the Church. We have not said that *we* should (which no human power could do) make that rent, or in your Grace’s language, ‘break the Church in two.’ Such rents can

¹ Charge of 1872, p. 35.

² See Dr. Liddon’s letter of January 3, 1872, quoted above, page 140.

never be the acts of any given number of individuals : they must arise out of deep convictions in the body of the Church itself. . . . In the case that the Church should tamper with the Athanasian Creed, . . . we should [not] dare, by retaining our offices of teaching in such portions of the Establishment as should be guilty of connivance in the prevailing heresy of the day, . . . to make ourselves guilty of the same ; or, by denying our Lord's words, 'He that believeth not shall be condemned,' deny Himself. . . . I think then, my dear Lord, that our people would, far and wide, be horrified and outraged by the virtual denial of the importance of revealed truth to salvation, and the contradiction or ignoring of our Lord's words ; and that they would be panic-stricken at the prospect of continued change which it would open to them. . . . Any who have spoken lightly of Bishops heretofore might probably regard any such change, if brought about by Bishops (which God forbid) as a reason the more to hold light by authority which would have betrayed the truth. . . . The difficulty would be for the laity rather than for us, the clergy. We, the clergy, could remain in communion with those portions of the Church of England which should still be faithful to the old belief, but apart from the Establishment, awaiting its dissolution ; and could minister to all who should feel as we do, and who could come to us. How the scattered laity are to be provided for, except by an extensive schism, I know not. The event only could show. In this ignorance I used in a letter, upon which, I suppose, your Grace animadvert¹, the expression 'a rent *in* or *from* the Church,' not wishing to express more clearly my fears as to a future, which I hoped might never be ; but meaning by 'a rent *in* the Church,' a division of the Church itself ; by a 'rent *from* it,' the tearing away of its members to join some other body or bodies, whether the Greek Church, or the Old Catholics, or the Roman Church. But the rent, if made, would not be of our making. The responsibility would not lie with us, who are grateful to the Church for having preserved to us the use and teaching of the Creed to which we are so much indebted, and who in all respects willingly acquiesced in the state of things, in which, by God's

¹ There is no such letter as this among the Archbishop's papers. It is, of course, possible that the Archbishop may have seen letters written by Dr. Pusey to others ; but Dr. Liddon's letters had been explicit, and it was to these, no doubt, that the Archbishop alluded. See p. 140.

providence [? we were placed], and who have never wished to bring about any change in any of our formularies, which are the common birthright of us all. We should simply remain faithful to that which we have been taught from our youth, the expression and guide of the faith of our riper years, which the Church of England upheld when we devoted ourselves to the service of God in her. The rent would be caused, not by us—who should be cast out of our homes, who would have to sacrifice all the cherished hopes of our lives—but by those (whoever they may be) who would trample upon our consciences, and the consciences of the laity who are faithful to the old belief.

“I doubt not that, unless encouraged by those in high places, the tornado which has been raised would spend itself, and that the result of the agitation will only be a more intelligent appreciation of the Creed.

“If the storm so suddenly raised be yielded to, it will tear down much more, which they who now look on or encourage it will mourn. At no time, perhaps, were the prospects of the Church of England more hopeful than now; or has there been equal promise that it would be an instrument of great good in gathering in the harvest of the Lord. But such times are times of strong convictions, not of the clergy only or mainly, but of the people; and such convictions are not safely trampled upon.—Praying that God will guide your Grace, I beg to remain, your Grace’s faithful servant,
E. B. PUSEY.”

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. Dr. Pusey.

“ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
26th October 1872.

“MY DEAR DR. PUSEY,—The business connected with my visitation has prevented me from sooner answering your weighty letter. . . .

“I am not without good hope that a satisfactory solution of the difficulties respecting the Athanasian Creed may be arrived at, and I shall feel very much obliged by your letting me know what solution of the difficulty you would be likely to agree to. I have professed my readiness to accept the explanatory rubric which has been sanctioned by the Oxford Professors, unless any other course is preferred. It is, however, impossible to conceal

that the idea of an explanatory rubric was not agreeable to Convocation. A very large committee of both Houses of Convocation will meet, I hope, on the 3d of December, with the view of considering all practicable courses. You know as well as I do of how old standing the question is in our Church, and how the difficulty is felt by many of the most orthodox, both of our clergy and laity. It is high time that the matter should be set at rest. I think further agitation of the question will not do good, and I am in hopes that you may be able to see your way to some solution which will satisfy the many devout minds disturbed by the present condition of things. I was glad to see a large committee appointed by the meeting at Leeds. . . . Sincerely yours,

“A. C. CANTUAR.”

The Rev. Dr. Pusey to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“CHRIST CHURCH, OXFORD,
October 28, 1872.

“MY DEAR LORD,—I beg to thank your Grace for your letter. Your Grace will have gathered from my letter that we consider the question raised as to the Athanasian Creed a matter of first principles. Whether the objection is raised to the statements of doctrine in the Creed, or to the warning clauses, or to both intermingled, it is a question of truth or falsehood. . . . I have read every suggestion which has been made in the *Guardian*, and, I think, in the *Times* also, and I have seen no one which does not involve an implied slur on the Athanasian Creed. The avowed reason for desiring change is that there is something amiss in or about the Creed. . . . I am not at all wedded to the ‘explanation’ of the Oxford Professors.¹ Indeed, individually, I should have preferred one which should have included the mention of sin or fault in those who should be condemned. I enclose a form,² which, if it should approve itself to your Grace, would satisfy me. But I ought to say that I do not myself see the

¹ See above, p. 133.

² The “form” is as follows: “The declarations of the Athanasian Creed, as to the necessity of the faith therein declared to salvation, are, like the words of our Lord upon which they are founded—‘*He that believeth not shall be condemned,*’ to be understood as laying down the general principle of the necessity of such faith to salvation for those who can have it. The application of these principles to the case of individuals belongs to the Judge of all, Who will condemn those only who have, out of perverse will, rejected Him.”

necessity for any such formula. . . . The idea of an explanatory note, in the abstract, found favour, as your Grace observes, with very few. The defenders of the Athanasian Creed seem to have looked upon it as a concession that some such explanation was needed, which they were not prepared to grant. . . . Lord Shaftesbury's 7000 are but an insignificant fraction of the Church of England. Strange and sad as to me is this coalition of many of the Evangelicals with men who do not believe as we do, I do not think that these 7000 names imply as many convictions. Lord Shaftesbury himself wrote to me, not as having any objection to the Athanasian Creed or its warning clauses, but simply excepting to its very occasional use, in consequence of which it startles people, which it would not, he thought, if recited every Sunday.¹—I beg to remain, your Grace's faithful servant,

“E. B. PUSEY.”

The reference in this letter is to a ‘Lay Memorial’ promoted by Lord Shaftesbury, who, on July 4, 1872, transmitted it to the two Archbishops. The memorial, which was signed by about 7000 persons, was in the following terms:—

“We, the undersigned, being lay members of the Church of England, hereby respectfully address your Lordships on the subject of the Athanasian Creed, and, without passing any opinion on a document so long received by the Church, we express an earnest desire that measures be taken to render the recital of it in the public services of the Church no longer compulsory.”

To this the Archbishops, a few days later, returned a joint reply:—

“LAMBETH PALACE, *July 22, 1872.*

“MY LORD,—We beg leave to acknowledge the receipt of a memorial, respecting the use of the Athanasian Creed in the public service of the Church, signed by your Lordship and about 7000 other lay members of the Church of England. That part

¹ It may be observed that the letters addressed by Lord Shaftesbury to the Archbishop on this subject do not correspond with the view Dr. Pusey had formed of his opinions. See also Lord Shaftesbury's *Life*, vol. iii. pp. 301, 309.

of the Creed which contains what are called 'the Damnatory Clauses' has long been the subject of discussion; and the present memorial shows that these clauses still give great offence to many faithful members of our Church. Indeed, there is no great section of our Church which has not intimated its readiness to accept some change in order to remove the offence. [The Archbishops then recount the various suggestions made for an explanatory rubric, and continue.] . . . We find however the impression to be very general that none of these explanations would meet the requirements of the case. The Church of England differs from other churches, including the Church of Rome, in the frequency of the use of this creed before large congregations. Under all the circumstances, we are prepared to assent to the course now recommended to us, though it may have some inconveniences, and we beg leave to assure the memorialists, through your Lordship, that our endeavours will not be wanting to bring the difficult question to a satisfactory solution. While we think it right to pay due attention to the legitimate scruples of those who, through their zeal to maintain the truth as it has ever been taught by the Church of Christ, feel great anxiety respecting any change, we fully anticipate that, in conjunction with our brethren, we shall be able to devise some plan which will meet the wishes of that other large body of persons who object to the solemn use of words which they regard as unauthorised, in their most obvious sense, either by the letter or the spirit of Holy Scripture.—We have the honour to be, my Lord, your Lordships' obedient servants,

"A. C. CANTUAR.

"W. EBOR."

From among many letters of criticism and indignation which flowed in upon the Archbishop from High Church quarters when this reply was made public, one may perhaps be quoted, emanating as it did from a lawyer of considerable position :—

— to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"July 31, 1872.

"MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I write for myself and many friends to express our astonishment and dismay at the letter from your

Grace and the Archbishop of York to Lord Shaftesbury respecting the use of the Athanasian Creed.

"That you should have cowered before the arrogant threat of his Lordship that the laity (*i.e.* he himself) would take the matter into their own hands: that you should have favoured the Socinian party in this country, . . . and preferred the scepticism of the smaller motley detachment to the staunch faith of the larger body of true members of the Church is indeed a marvel. . . . For you do not, it is to be hoped, imagine that any of the faithful laity will hold communion with any clergyman who repudiates this creed, . . . or, which is worse, throws contumely and reproach upon it by refusing or neglecting to repeat it. I tell you, my Lord, that we will not even receive such a man into our houses, far less will any of us go to his Church. . . . The whole controversy has been distinguished by the enormous and reckless lying of those who desire the change. First the creed was an invention and a novelty, and now, when that is proved to be a transparent falsehood, and that it is as ancient and as authoritative as any, then it is said it is not used 'before large congregations' in other Churches. . . .

"I will, in conclusion, ask you, Do you suppose that you, in your dying hour, can regard with any satisfaction *or hope of mercy* this attempt to depreciate and set aside one great portion of the Catholic faith, or do you think that I shall then regret having stood up in its defence?—I am, your Grace's obedient servant,

"———."

There were many other letters not greatly differing in tone from this, and the columns of some of the 'religious' newspapers were full of laments over the respect shown by the Primates to such a memorial, emanating from such a source.

But, on the whole, men were becoming weary of the strife, and the mass of moderate High Churchmen began to see that some step was now inevitable. Bishop Moberly of Salisbury, one of the staunchest of High Churchmen, published, to the wrath of his friends, an earnest appeal for the omission of the damnatory clauses from the creed ;¹

¹ He thought this might be done by the next "Pan-Anglican Synod."

and Dr. Pusey, in a stern reply to Bishop Moberly's "sad and unlooked-for argument," himself suggested yet another 'explanatory rubric' for adoption by the Church. Lord Salisbury again, who was supposed to have declared in a meeting held at Leeds that he would oppose any relaxation or relief whatever, replied as follows to the Archbishop, who had asked his view of the plan that the public use of the creed should be made optional :—

The Marquis of Salisbury to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"MANOR HOUSE, CRANBORNE,
October 29, 1872.

"MY DEAR LORD,— . . . If the two opposite views on this subject are to be brought together, it can only be by some sacrifice of uniformity. I do not see how any discretionary relaxation can be placed in any other hands except those of the Bishop.

"The laity are practically voiceless, from want of organisation : and I do not see how the objects of any side would be satisfied by placing the discretion in the hands of the incumbent. The policy of an explanatory note is very doubtful. It would have to pass through both Houses of Parliament, and the success of Parliament in providing grammar for the Statute-Book is so indifferent that I should be sorry to see them try their hands at a dogmatic definition. The objects of such a rubric would be served to a great extent by a formal declaration from Convocation, if any could be found that would command general assent.— Believe me, yours very faithfully, SALISBURY."

In a subsequent letter Lord Salisbury says :—

"If the question can be set at rest by an explanatory rubric, no doubt that will be the most agreeable course to the advocates of the retention of the Creed. My suggestion of giving the Bishop a discretion was only made upon the assumption that the idea of an explanatory note had been given up. It was in no sense an original suggestion, but came either from Dr. Liddon or the Bishop of Winchester, I forget which.

"I shall be at Hatfield from about the 20th of November,

and shall be at your Grace's command if you should have occasion to see me."

The Archbishop had summoned the large Committee of Convocation to meet at Lambeth on December 3, and he threw all his energy into an effort to secure that some definite and, if possible, final decision should then be arrived at. His fear was that the same heated arguments and interdenunciations which had done service in Convocation would reappear and wreck his hopes, and he wrote to several of the leaders on either side to urge the necessity, after so many months of strife, of accepting some arrangement, even if not the best imaginable. Dean Stanley showed himself open to such an appeal, though he had in no whit changed his views.

The Dean of Westminster to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

• "DEANERY, Nov. 28, 1872.

"MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,—Many thanks for your note. I am quite prepared to advocate not the best course abstractedly but the best course practicable.

"An explanatory note, however, I cannot support, unless combined with some practical consequence, and I shall much prefer that things should remain as they are rather than that an explanatory note should be put forward as the remedy for allaying the scruples for the sake of which the Committee is convoked. . . . Would it not be possible (supposing that nothing can be done) to put forward a declaration which should express the real facts of the case, viz.—that the use of the Creed is left, not from any concurrence in its contents, but out of deference to the scruples of certain distinguished clergymen—specifying, if desirable, the Regius Professor of Hebrew and the Ireland Professor of Exegesis at Oxford.¹

"This I should regard as a course much more to be desired than any explanatory note, which, even if it were so drawn up as to satisfy those who object to the damnatory clauses, would leave the recitation of them in public open to the same objections as before.

¹ Dr. Pusey and Dr. Liddon.

"I consider that the explanatory note has always been an endeavour, not to relieve the scruples of those aggrieved, but to retain the use of the creed in spite of the objections felt to it.—
Ever yours,
A. P. STANLEY."

Dr. Pusey, on the other hand, replied :—

"I have heard from different quarters that the mind of the quiet clergy has been much strengthened in behalf of the Athanasian Creed. These are slow to speak, but very firm when they have taken their line."¹

When the huge committee of some fifty members met at Lambeth on December 3, two things were clear. First, that nearly every one present had made up his mind upon the subject, and was prepared with his vote and, if necessary, with the reasons for it; and secondly, that the general 'mind' was very different now from what it had been a few months before in the Jerusalem Chamber. The weighty charges of the leading Bishops,² delivered in September and October, had made an unusual impression on the Church, and the voices raised in favour of leaving things alone were now faint and few and far between. Bishop Wilberforce was among the many whose mind had changed in one direction or the other since the controversy first began, and it was on his motion that it was now agreed that a Synodical declaration should be put forth, which might ultimately take its place as an explanatory rubric in the Book of Common Prayer. The other suggestions which had been made were each of them proposed in turn and rejected by large majorities. Dean Stanley protested with all his might against the course pursued, and hoped the country would clearly

¹ Dr. Pusey was not a member of Convocation, and could not therefore attend the meeting, but the Archbishop had expressed a hope for his influence on the side of peace.

² The Bishops of St. David's and of Peterborough had dealt specially and at great length with the subject.

understand that it was the authorities of the Church who had now finally refused to relieve her children's burdened consciences. He earnestly opposed any expression of sympathy for those thus burdened. It would be a bitter mockery to say gentle words when all gentle action was declined. But the 'moderates' had their way, and the Archbishop, who had foreseen that it would be impossible to carry the plan which he still continued to prefer, concurred in urging the declaration as the next best course.

The subsequent history of the matter is soon told. Convocation in 1873 considered in long and even wearisome detail what the wording of the declaration ought to be ; but there was little attempt to reopen the question as a whole, and at last, on May 9, 1873, an agreement was arrived at. In the Archbishop's final speech upon the subject he pointed out once more the double character of the relief which had been asked : relief for those who disliked the use of the creed in church, and relief for those who were required, on ordination, to sign a declaration that they believed it. For the former class, to his own disappointment, no help, or very little, had been accorded. But he gladly accepted the relief which the declaration gave to the scruples of those who were required to sign.

"For two long years," he said, "we have had this subject discussed in every conceivable form, both privately and publicly, in print and *vivâ voce*. Therefore we can all pretty well make up our minds as to what we wish to do, and, what is quite as important, what we can do. Because it is one thing to wish to follow a particular course, and another to be able to follow it. . . . I think the objection to the speeches of my right Rev. brethren the Bishops of Norwich and Exeter¹ is this: that because they cannot get all that they want they will not even have half of what they want. Let us practically consider for one

¹ These Bishops, desiring (like the Archbishop) the disuse of the creed in public service, objected to the "declaration" altogether.

moment where we are. . . . I have always had a very considerable difficulty in dealing with young men as to their subscriptions on this particular point. I have endeavoured, when any one has said he had a difficulty about the creed of S. Athanasius, to give an explanation of what it meant; and it is the greatest comfort to me to find that the explanation I am in the habit of giving is indorsed by Convocation. I do not mean to say it sets the matter at rest. I do not know whether it does or not. . . . I quite agree that it does not solve the question about the use of the creed in the public service of the Church. That is another matter, and we shall see what effect it has. . . . Of course in dealing with old forms there is always the greatest difficulty. It is not easy to say whether any exact form of words exists which does not require some sort of explanation to certain minds; and with regard to this particular creed there is no doubt at all that it does require a great deal of explanation to almost every mind. And I think very considerable benefit will have been done by the discussions which have taken place, with the result that the two Houses of Convocation of this province—if not for the relief of all persons, yet for the assistance of those who have to subscribe to the creed of S. Athanasius—declare with as much authority as they possess the sense in which alone they think this creed ought to be subscribed.”¹

The declaration thus agreed to by both parties was as follows:—

“For the removal of doubts, and to prevent disquietude in the use of the creed commonly called the Creed of S. Athanasius, this synod doth solemnly declare:—

“1. That the Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of S. Athanasius, doth not make any addition to the faith as contained in Holy Scripture, but warneth against errors which from time to time have arisen in the Church of Christ.

“2. That as Holy Scripture in divers places doth promise life to them that believe and declare the condemnation of them that believe not, so doth the Church in this confession declare the necessity for all who would be in a state of salvation of holding fast the Catholic faith,

¹ See *Chronicle of Convocation*, May 7, 1873, p. 309.

and the great peril of rejecting the same. Wherefore the warnings in this confession of faith are to be understood no otherwise than the like warnings in Holy Scripture, for we must receive God's threatenings even as His promises, in such wise as they are generally set forth in Holy Writ. Moreover, the Church doth not herein pronounce judgment on any particular person or persons, God alone being the Judge of all."

The conduct of the Archbishop in this long controversy has been criticised with almost equal severity from two opposite sides. Dr. Pusey and his friends, as we have seen, regarded him as ready at any moment to "betray the truth," and to "trample upon the consciences of the faithful." Dean Burgon wrote to the *Guardian*,¹ as one "constrained to reckon" the Archbishop "among the Church's foes," and some of the religious newspapers overflowed with comments of a similar kind. Dean Stanley, on the other hand, and with him a large body of lay churchmen, lamented the loss, perhaps the final loss, of a great opportunity. They thought that by consenting to so "paltry" an alternative as an "explanatory rubric" he had helped to rivet more firmly the fetters that remained, and had even detracted from the legitimate reverence in which the other two creeds are held: "There it stands now," exclaimed the Dean a few years later to a friend, "and there, thanks to this waste of an opportunity, it will go on standing until it carries off the other two creeds upon its back. When that day comes it will be seen who was right in the present controversy."

Instead of attempting to decide between these critics, or to condemn them all, it has seemed best to let the facts speak for themselves. The controversy was tedious at the time: to some readers perhaps its narration has been tedious now; but comparatively small as the issue

¹ Of February 1, 1871, p. 130.

may appear, the principles involved were so grave, and the time occupied was so great, that it is impossible in any true life of the Archbishop to pass the matter quickly by. Right or wrong, his own convictions on the subject never varied. He neither obtained nor professed to have obtained the solution he desired; but he was characteristically ready to take the second-best alternative if the best was unattainable. The question came up again six years later when the report upon the rubrics as a whole was submitted by Convocation to the Queen, and the Archbishop took occasion to show publicly¹ that neither as to the convictions he held nor as to the policy he advocated had he undergone any change whatever.

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, July 1, 1879, p. 263.

CHAPTER XXIII.

CONFESSION.

PETITION TO CONVOCATION IN 1873. THE 'PRIEST IN
ABSOLUTION, 1877.

1873-1877.

ON Friday, May 9, 1873, the Archbishop read in Convocation a long petition signed by 483 priests of the Church of England upon the subject of contemplated changes in the Book of Common Prayer. Many topics were dealt with in the document, but the clause which chiefly arrested public attention was as follows :—

“That in view of the widespread and increasing use of Sacramental Confession, your Venerable House may consider the advisability of providing for the education, selection, and licensing of duly qualified confessors in accordance with the provisions of Canon Law.”

The presentation of this petition may be almost said to constitute a ‘new departure’ in the history of the Church of England. There could be no question that the practice of habitual private Confession had been steadily increasing during the fifteen years which had elapsed since Bishop Tait dealt with it in his primary Charge as Bishop of London, and a far larger proportion of clergy were now to be found who were ready, whatever their own practice might be, to look leniently on the course adopted by those of their brethren who made ‘Sacramental Confession’ a regular part of their pastoral work. But the unanimity of the Bishops had been so unbroken in declaring the

habitual use of private Confession to be contrary to the spirit and teaching of the Church of England, that the advocates of its wider adoption had been content if they could secure a tacit sufferance for their practice, and had not ventured to demand any individual or corporate Episcopal recognition for their revival of what had been so long disused. Bishop Wilberforce had perhaps been foremost among the Bishops in denouncing any attempt to reimport into the Church of England the Roman or quasi-Roman system which had been deliberately abandoned ; and even in the exceptional and difficult case of such Sisterhoods as that at Clewer he had emphatically declared that—

“ If Sisterhoods cannot be maintained, except upon a semi-Romanist scheme with its ‘*direction*,’ . . . its perpetual Confession, and its un-English tone, I am perfectly convinced that we had better have no Sisterhoods.”¹

Such had been his judgment many years before ; he had never varied from it since ; and if this was the view of the Bishop who was regarded as the High Churchmen’s champion, there was scant encouragement for expecting that a more indulgent line could be taken by the rest of the Episcopate. It was a bold step therefore to ask, as the petitioners now did, “ in view of the widespread and increasing use of Sacramental Confession,” for the distinct licensing of confessors, and their consequent enrolment as a part of the recognised system of the Church. For, as was pointed out in the debates, the context of the clause in question, and the whole character of the long petition, forbade the supposition that what was wanted was a provision merely for the exceptional and, so to speak, ‘ medicinal ’ Confession and Absolution which, in the opinion of the Bishops, was all that the Prayer-Book authorised. The known

¹ *Bishop Wilberforce’s Life*, vol. iii. p. 328.

teaching and practice of the foremost among the signatories of the petition excluded such an interpretation of their request. They had resolved deliberately that it was wise and right to ask for a formal recognition of their system, and the petition bore that fact upon its face.

In the debate which arose upon the presentation of the petition the Archbishop's words were reserved and guarded, and it seems to have been generally felt by the Bishops that the matter was so grave as to require that whatever reply they gave should be the outcome of deliberate thought and quiet discussion. Accordingly, upon the motion of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, it was unanimously resolved that "a Committee of the whole House should consider and report upon the teaching of the Church of England on the subject of Confession." The Archbishop referred in his speech to his own action in the matter fifteen years before, and expressed his continued adherence to the views he had then announced.

"I am glad to know," he added, "that every member of this Synod here present altogether repudiates the practice of habitual Confession, and that they all state with the utmost distinctness that they consider the sacramental view of Confession a most serious error. . . . The point, however, has this difficulty: it is very difficult to lay down general rules which limit the free intercourse between a clergyman and his parishioners—his penitent parishioners—on the one hand, and which put down 'Sacramental Confession' on the other. This may be a very difficult matter to determine, but where we find that either a young man or an old man has transgressed the limits of propriety, and has introduced that which is alien to the Church of England, we are bound to exercise whatever authority we possess in order to curb the evil which is thus likely to spring up. . . . I say that we are bound, as Bishops, to watch the growth of this evil. If it grows and increases among us, it shall not be for want of that careful attention which we, by the appointment of this Committee, desire to give to the subject."¹

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, May 9, 1873, pp. 385-7.

There was thus on the part of the Bishops no compromise whatever with regard to that part of the petition which referred to the Confessional. Convocation could not meet during the weeks which followed, but most of the Bishops were in active correspondence with the Archbishop upon the subject, and the letters and suggestions he received from them before they met as a Committee to agree upon the final draft of their Declaration form a packet as bulky as it is important. But the fact that they had taken time to speak with the necessary deliberation and calmness was resented by their more fiery critics as an unpardonable sin. Indignation meetings to denounce the "traitorous priests" who had signed the petition were held in the large towns, and Lord Shaftesbury put himself at the head of the movement. A few weeks after the petition had been presented, he wrote to the Archbishop to ask what action the Bishops meant to take. The Archbishop replied that Convocation was to meet in the following month, when the Episcopal Report would be made public. Upon this Lord Shaftesbury wrote again :—

"It is not for me to make any remark on the judgment of the Episcopal Bench. Their Lordships must know much better than I the reasons for the delay. The public feeling is urgent in requiring some expression of opinion, and the more so as the general tone of the discussion in the Upper House of Convocation did not in any way abate the alarm that was excited by the contents and the prayer of the petition. . . . Should action be soon taken, your Grace, I am sure, will not think us precipitate."

Accordingly, on June 30, a mass meeting was held in Exeter Hall, under the presidency of Lord Shaftesbury, who spoke as follows, amid immense enthusiasm :—

"Such was the petition presented to the Upper House of Convocation of the Southern Province, and he asked the

meeting that, supposing such a petition as that had been presented to *them*—to them collectively or individually—how would they have received it? They would have said, 'Away with the unclean thing,' for such a petition was in degradation of God's law, and there was no word strong enough to express the disgust which they would have felt for it. Supposing the petition had been one addressed to the Bishops of the same Convocation for the abolition of the Episcopate, or one for the removal of their Lordships, the Bishops, from the House of Lords, would they have pondered over it for a moment? How would such a petition have been received?—in the same manner as this petition for the institution of Auricular Confession? He would tell them how this petition from the 483 priests was received. It would be seen by the official report in the *Guardian* that this most preposterous, this most hateful proposition for the erection of the Confessional in the English Church, was received, discussed, and deliberated upon by the Bishops! The language throughout was soft and delicate, and the worst said was that this disgusting document was a 'serious error' on the part of some clergy, and it was referred to a Committee. It was possible to praise a thing with a show of faint condemnation, and he firmly believed that this thing was not so distasteful to the Bishops as it was to nineteen out of every twenty of the British people. Why should the Bishops want to deliberate upon such a thing? Was there a man among the Bishops who did not know that the very proposal itself was a scandal to Holy Scripture? And for them to take it into deliberation, to question how far Confession was consistent or inconsistent with the rubrics, was an insult. What were the rubrics? If they were against Holy Scripture, let all the rubrics go to the wind. The practice asked for was not consistent with the rubrics, and the Bishops knew this. Why did they not at once say, 'Away with this foul rag—this pollution of the red one of Babylon'? These Bishops were the men who had sworn they would drive away heresy. Why, heresy had driven them away, for in the deliberation on the petition they were mealy-mouthed to a contemptible degree: the discussion was unworthy of reasonable men, and it was more than unworthy of the Episcopate that the whole thing should have had the honour of being 'referred to a Committee.' What was the Committee to consider? . . . When Convocation took such a step as had been taken, it became the duty of the laity to take

the matter into their own hands, and evoke such of the clergy as would go with them, and it would be then seen that, whatever might be the opinions of the Episcopate, there were many thousands of the clergy in the Church of England who would not, like these recreants and idolaters, bow the knee to Baal. He had written to the Archbishop of Canterbury that the laity were in great alarm at these propositions ; that they turned to their Bishops, and requested to know the purpose of the Episcopal Bench in the matter. The Archbishop had replied to this communication that the matter had been considered by the Bishops ; that they had now gone into their dioceses, and that they would meet early in July. This was the balm for the comfort of the troubled English Churchman—the soothing syrup for his pain. It was not to be wondered at, therefore, if clergy and laity now took the matter into their own hands, and so this meeting was called.”

Some ten days later Lord Oranmore re-opened the question in the House of Lords, and the Archbishop, in replying to the attack, which was not in itself of much importance, took occasion to allude to Lord Shaftesbury's Exeter Hall speech. He denied that these questions of religious controversy were so simple as was often supposed :—

“The difficulties now presenting themselves are manifold. They are shared in by every Church and by every religious communion. There is an unsettlement in men's opinions, and the unsettlement is by no means on one side only. It requires great care, attention, and wisdom on the part of those who have to guide the Church of England, if they are to guide it clear of the dangers which threaten it on both sides. . . . I do not complain of the noble Lord or of any one else speaking out to the Bishops. What is the use of Bishops if they are not to be spoken to? In political matters, when there is nobody else to blame, it is not unusual to blame Her Majesty's Ministers. Well, in religious matters, if there is nobody else to blame, why not blame the Bishops? I am sorry the noble Earl—the Earl of Shaftesbury—is not here this evening, for I should like to have stated in his presence that strength of language is not always, perhaps, proof of a strong cause ; and that if it be, as he

says, a fault to use mild language, that is not a fault of which we can accuse those who have offered the Bishops advice."

The private discussion and correspondence about the coming Episcopal Declaration continued for some weeks, and the document was not presented to Convocation and made public till July 23. It was the outcome of many drafts, and its final shape appears to have been the handiwork mainly of Bishops Wilberforce,¹ Moberly, Wordsworth, and the Archbishop himself. It received the unanimous assent of all the Bishops in Convocation, and it was destined afterwards to receive a far wider authorisation. When the Lambeth Conference of 1878 had to deal with the same subject, the principal sentences of this Declaration were adopted, not without discussion, but without a single dissentient voice, as the deliberate judgment of the hundred Bishops then assembled—and the document may thus claim, in no ordinary sense, to be the authoritative utterance of the Anglican Church as to the rule her clergy ought to follow in their dealings with souls in need of help.

The following are its words :—

"In the matter of Confession the Church of England holds fast those principles which are set forth in Holy Scripture, which were professed by the Primitive Church, and which were re-affirmed at the English Reformation.

"The Church of England, in the Twenty-fifth Article, affirms that Penance is not to be counted for a Sacrament of the Gospel, and, as judged by her Formularies, knows no such words as 'Sacramental Confession.'

"Grounding her doctrine on Holy Scripture, she distinctly declares the full and entire forgiveness of sins, through the blood of Jesus Christ, to all who bewail their own sinfulness, confess themselves to Almighty God with full purpose of amendment of life, and turn with true faith unto Him.

¹ See *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1877, p. 234.

"It is the desire of the Church that by this way and means all her children should find peace. In this spirit the forms of Confession and Absolution are set forth in her public Services, yet for the relief of troubled consciences she has made special provision in two exceptional cases.

"1. In the case of those who cannot quiet their own consciences previously to receiving the Holy Communion, but require further comfort or counsel, the Minister is directed to say, 'Let him come to me, or to 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, together with Ghostly Counsel and Advice.'

"Nevertheless it is to be noted that for such a case no form of Absolution has been prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and, further, that the rubric in the first Prayer-Book of 1549, which sanctioned a particular form of Absolution, has been withdrawn from all subsequent editions of the said book.

"2. In the Order for the Visitation of the Sick it is directed that the sick man be moved to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter; but in such case Absolution is only to be given when the sick man shall humbly and heartily desire it.

"This special provision, however, does not authorise the Ministers of the Church to require, from any who may resort to them to open their grief, a particular or detailed enumeration of all their sins, or to require private Confession previous to receiving the 'Holy Communion,' or to enjoin or even encourage any practice of habitual Confession to a priest, or to teach that such practice of habitual Confession, or the being subject to what has been termed the direction of a priest, is a condition of attaining to the highest spiritual life."

There, for a time, the matter was allowed to rest. The question was raised here and there in individual cases, in different dioceses, but, so far as public or corporate action was concerned, the deliberate and authoritative Declaration which had been published was felt to be enough.¹

¹ When the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874 was passing through Parliament, an attempt was made to alter its character so as to include the practice of Confession. But the Archbishop peremptorily refused to listen to the suggestion. See below, p. 197.

Suddenly, after four years' interval, the question was unexpectedly re-opened in the House of Lords, and although the episode does not chronologically belong to this Chapter, it is so closely connected with what has just been told that it may be simpler to recount it here.

The explosion did not, on this occasion, have its rise in any partisan movement on one side or the other. Lord Redesdale, a sober and trusted High Churchman of the earlier sort, and a prominent figure for more than thirty years as Chairman of Committees in the House of Lords, rose on June 14, 1877, to call the attention of the House to a book which had been placed in his hands. He was no novice in religious controversy. He was one of the foremost promoters of the revival of Convocation in 1853. He had championed the High Church opposition to the Divorce Act of 1857, and had faced Archbishop Manning, in 1875, on behalf of the Catholicity of the Anglican Church. His shrewd insight and vigorous common sense were as well known in the House as his old-fashioned tail-coat and brass buttons, and it would have been difficult to find a spokesman who had earned a better right to a respectful hearing in Parliament on any matter affecting the Church of England. The book to which he drew attention was called "*The Priest in Absolution*, Part II. : A Manual for such as are called unto the Higher Ministries in the English Church. Privately printed for the use of the Clergy." It contained a series of elaborate instructions for those "who desire to have at hand a sort of *Vade mecum* for easy reference in the discharge of their duties as Confessors."

A few sentences from Lord Redesdale's speech will make its character clear:—

"The fact," he said, "of such a work being in existence is well worthy the consideration of your Lordships' House, and of

the whole country. . . . The Society by which it is printed and circulated is called *The Society of the Holy Cross*, and has among its members many well-known, and in some respects, very excellent men. . . . I am informed that the book was compiled by a gentleman now dead, from whose widow the Society purchased the copyright. . . . I will not quote many extracts to your Lordships; but, to show the character of the book, I feel bound to quote two or three. Here is one—

“‘There is no resource for the spiritually sick but private confession and absolution; and to make that effectual it is necessary that the penitent be examined with discretion and expertness.’

“‘It then proceeds to state the way in which these examinations are to be carried on. It says—

“‘Children may receive absolution with much spiritual benefit after seven, or even five or six.’”

Lord Redesdale went on to quote other extracts relating especially to the Priest's inquiries from penitents respecting violations of the Law of Purity. It was mainly with reference to these portions of the book that the public sentiment made itself felt, both inside and outside Parliament, and yet many of the quotations read by Lord Redesdale in the House were necessarily withheld from publication either in the newspapers or in *Hansard*. His speech was short and simple, and having stated his case he left it with others to take action.

“‘I must say, my Lords, that I think it high time the laity should move in this matter. Hitherto it has been treated too much as one exclusively for the clergy. . . . In calling your Lordships' attention to the subject, I am actuated simply by a sense of duty, for I feel that the time has arrived when there should be a decided condemnation of such practices.’”¹

The Archbishop rose at once to reply. He had not, he said, seen the volume until it was sent him by the noble Earl, and his belief was that the clergy represented by such a book were very few in number. He quoted to the

¹ *Hansard*, June 14, 1877, pp. 1741-1745.

House the formal Declaration of 1873, as showing the Bishops' wish to counteract such teaching as that of the Society in question, and he expressed the surprise with which he had heard the names of some of its members :—

“I trust that the clergymen connected with this Society will feel that they have fallen into a most grievous mistake. Perhaps their motive may have been a good one ; indeed I should say that certainly it has been, because they have acted with the view—a faulty one no doubt—of being better able to guide the minds of those intrusted to their spiritual care. But they have made a most grievous mistake in endeavouring to pry into the secret thoughts of the human heart in matters of this delicate character. I am certain that if such a course is persevered in, it will have very evil results—first, in the harm it will do to their own minds ; secondly, in the harm it will do to the minds of those who come to them, and whom they address in the terms pointed out in this book ; and thirdly, in its effect as regards the influence in families of the clergy of that Church whose interests they wish to further. . . . If the father of a family had any reason to suppose that any member of his family had been exposed to such an examination, I am sure it would be his duty to remonstrate with the clergyman who had put the questions, and warn him never to approach his house again. I have ventured, my Lords, to express my own feelings on this matter very strongly, but I have no reason to suppose that I am not the mouthpiece of the whole Bench on this occasion.”¹

In the short debate which followed, not a single Peer rose to defend either the book or the Society, and the Archbishop proceeded at once to take such action as seemed possible.

Convocation was to meet in little more than a fortnight, and in the meantime he communicated both with the ‘Master’ of the Society,² and with several individual members of it, with whom he was personally well acquainted. The result was an interview of great importance,

¹ *Hansard*, June 14, 1877, pp. 1745-1748.

² The Rev. J. F. Bagshawe.

the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London meeting the Office-bearers of the Society at Lambeth, when a clear and exhaustive statement as to the origin, objects, and practice of the Society was placed in the Archbishop's hands, and every opportunity was given for such further investigation as he might desire. It became evident, within a very few days after the House of Lords debate, that many members of the Society had been as much startled as the outside public, by some of the characteristics of their extraordinary Manual. Several members of the Society wrote directly to the Archbishop in repudiation of the book, and, great as had been the respect for its author,¹ who died in 1874, scarcely any one was found ready to express approval of his handiwork. Such a letter as the following, which was published at the time, speaks for itself:—

The Rev. F. N. Oxenham to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“S. BARNABAS', PIMLICO, S.W., June 19, 1877.

“MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—As your Grace took up the question relating to a book now in the possession of The Society of the Holy Cross when it came before the House of Lords a few days ago, I trust your Grace will permit me, as a member of the Society referred to, to make the following remarks:—

“I listened to the debate on Thursday last with feelings akin to indignation that a Society which I greatly respected should become the object not only of direct accusation, but also of those injurious suspicions which that debate was calculated to arouse. On my return home I referred to my copy of *The Priest in Absolution*, which I had not previously read. When the book first came to me some years ago, I put it, unread, under lock and key, simply feeling that it was not my duty to read the book, and trusting that its contents were what they should be with a view to its designed object; but when, in consequence of your Grace's observations, I looked into the book, I felt that no words

¹ The Rev. J. C. Chambers.

could be too strong to condemn the principles advocated, and the advice given in that book as to the questioning of persons who came to Confession. If the practice of Confession involved, which it certainly does not, any such questioning, I should regard it with abhorrence. I am sure, my Lord, that a very large number of the members of the Society of the Holy Cross are as ignorant as I was of the contents of this unhappy book, and would repudiate its principles in the matter to which I have alluded as sincerely and utterly as I do. In justice to those persons, as well as to myself, I am venturing to trouble your Grace with this communication. I very deeply regret that the Society of the Holy Cross ever came into possession of this book, and I shall take the earliest opportunity open to a private member, to move that all remaining copies of the Second Part of *The Priest in Absolution* be forthwith destroyed.—I am, my Lord Archbishop, your faithful and humble servant,

“FRANK N. OXENHAM.”

Convocation met on July 3, and unusual attention was naturally directed to the debates. As a preliminary step, the Bishops sent down to the Lower House for its consideration the formal Declaration they had themselves drawn up some years before on the subject of Confession, and the Lower House, with scarcely a dissentient voice,¹ expressed its general concurrence in that document. When the resolution of agreement was presented in the Upper House, the Archbishop made a speech of some importance, calling attention to the fact that there was thus placed on record “a very clearly expressed declaration of the mind, both of the Bishops and of the Presbyters of the Province of Canterbury,” on the subject of the use of Confession in the Church of England. After alluding to the circumstances under which the question had been revived, he continued as follows :—

“It is always the most painful part of our duty as Bishops to be obliged to call in question the actions of devoted men, who

¹ The numbers were 62 against 6.

are spending their lives, according to the conviction of their consciences, for the advancement of what they believe to be the truth. . . . It must often have happened to your Lordships, as it has to me, in the course of a considerably extended life, to be acquainted, and that intimately, with members of the Roman Catholic Church. I am prepared to say, that some of the most excellent men I have ever known have been Roman Catholics, and that some of them, my intimate friends, have sacrificed every prospect in life in order conscientiously to give effect to those convictions which led them to separate themselves from the Church of England. It is, as I have said, the most painful part of a man's duty to know how he is to act to those whom he highly esteems, and who fall into grievous errors of this kind. The persons with whom we have now to deal, it appears to me, have adopted a system altogether alien from the system of the Church of England, which yet might not find its natural home, under existing circumstances, in the exaggerated Ultramontane form of the present Roman Catholic Church. . . . And though I am glad that the step should not be taken on the part of these men, of severing their connection with their old Communion, still I am sure that your Lordships will agree with me that it will be most dangerous to allow them in this Church power to propagate doctrines, to introduce and carry into effect practices, which are entirely alien from the spirit and teaching of the whole body of the divines of the Church of England from first to last. Now, my Lords, this is a very grave indictment. I would be understood to speak of no individual, for the peculiarities of the individual conscience are such that a man often does not see his way, and wanders in the expression of his opinions; and when he is recalled to a careful consideration of those opinions, he remodels them, and falls back upon that which he had seemed to be on the point of giving up. I therefore speak of no individual. . . . But, with regard to the system, I must express, on this public occasion, my most distinct opinion that it is a system not reconcilable with either the doctrines or the practice of the Church of which we are members. The book is now in the hands of all, or of many, of your Lordships; for the members of the Society have thought it proper to place their book, their statutes, and their defence of themselves in your hands; but I cannot separate this book from other movements which are going on around us. This morning I received another book, to which

I must invite your Lordships' attention for a few moments. It is called 'No. I. of a Series of Books for the Young,' and it is stated to be 'edited by a Committee of Clergy.' Now, my Lords, in dealing with all these matters we have a great difficulty from not knowing exactly whom we are dealing with. A secret society, or a society the names of the members of which are not produced, may be a very small or a very large society. . . . I should not be surprised if this Committee of Clergy, who publish this book, were a very small body. . . . But whatever be the number of persons who have edited this book, and sent it forth, it would appear that the number of copies issued, if we are to trust the title-page, is not few; because there we find that it has reached the eighth thousand. Obviously, if that be the fact, the book must have been tolerably widely disseminated. I take this book, as its contents show, to be meant for the instruction of very young children. I find, in one of the pages of it, the statement that between the ages of six and six and a half years would be the proper time for the inculcation of the teaching which is to be found in the book. Now, six to six and a half is certainly a very tender age, and to these children I find these statements addressed in the book :—

" 'It is to the priest, and to the priest only, that the child must acknowledge his sins, if he desires that God should forgive him.'

"I hope and trust the person, the three clergymen, or however many there were, did not exactly realise what they were writing; that they did not mean to say that a child was not to confess its sins to God direct; that it was not to confess its sins, at the age of six, to its mother, or to its father, but was only to have recourse to the priest. But the words, to say the least of them, are rash. Then comes the very obvious question :—

" 'Do you know why? It is because God, when He was on earth, gave to His priests, and to them alone, the Divine Power of forgiving men their sins. It was to priests alone that Jesus said—"Receive ye the Holy Ghost." . . . Those who will not confess will not be cured. Sin is a terrible sickness, and casts souls into hell.'

"That is addressed to a child six years of age.

" "I have known," the book continues, 'poor children who concealed their sins in confession for years; they were very unhappy, were tormented with remorse, and if they had died in that state they would certainly have gone to the everlasting fires of hell.' . . . 'I wish to say all' (the child is supposed to urge), 'but I do not know how to tell what I have done, it is so bad.' 'Well, say this to your

confessor, or simply, "I have done very bad things, but I do not know how to tell them." He will kindly help you ; he will ask you questions.'

"Now, my Lords, I think it is trifling to say that any person who disseminates this book does not intend to revolutionise the whole teaching of the Church of England on the subject of Confession. It is trifling to say that a person who, being intrusted with the cure of souls in one of our parishes, or being perhaps a choir-master in one of our cathedrals, commences this system with the children who are placed under his care, is not engaged in a great conspiracy to alter the whole system of the teaching of the Church of England on this matter. And it is childish to say that if you begin with teaching children such a view of Confession in their tenderest years, you do not desire to introduce an habitual, a necessary, and a really compulsory system of Confession into the Church of England. . . .

"I have now given your Lordships all the information that I have on this subject ; I do it with the greatest pain. I do it with a full appreciation of the goodness of the men with whom we have to deal ; but no admiration of any points in their character ought, I think, to make us hesitate as to whatever may appear to be our duty in the endeavour to counteract what I feel obliged to call a conspiracy within our own body, against the doctrine, the discipline, and the practice of our Reformed Church."¹

As the outcome of a long debate the Bishops agreed unanimously to a series of resolutions in which they held the Society of the Holy Cross responsible for the preparation and dissemination of the book, which they considered the Society neither to have repudiated nor effectually withdrawn, and they added, with equal unanimity, an expression of their "strong condemnation of any doctrine or practice of Confession which can be thought to render such a book necessary or expedient."

It was not an occasion on which the High Church Bishops shrank from speaking out. The condemnatory

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, July 6, 1877, pp. 310-315.

words of Bishops Selwyn and Moberly were as strong as any in the debate :—

“The system laid down in ‘this book,’ said Bishop Selwyn, “and in the rules of this Society, is such as would neither be accepted by the Church of Rome, nor can possibly be accepted by the Church of England. . . . I have to plead with those dear friends of my own [who belong to the Society] how it is that they can think it possible that we should be leagued together to interrupt any practice which is believed by them to be for the good of the Church, unless we in our consciences believed that the doctrines they teach, and the practices they pursue, are at variance with the doctrines and practices of the Church of England, which we in our hearts resolve to uphold, and which we believe to be the sacred treasure handed down to us to guard.”¹

Bishop Moberly of Salisbury, as one who had spent most of his life as head-master of a great public school, expressed his firm conviction that the practice of habitual Confession was “mischievous in the highest degree” :—

“I confess,” he added, “that there is not one thing in all the world which is deeper in my heart and conscience than the corrupting mischief of any such system as this getting into our schools. . . . [As to little children being taught to go to Confession in the manner described] it appears to me to be cruel in the last degree, and not only cruel, but utterly and entirely false.”²

It is not out of place to quote such words as these, inasmuch as it was frequently said, both at the time and subsequently, that it was from the Archbishop, rather than from the Bishops generally, that the stern condemnation had proceeded ; and, indeed, there were few of the Archbishop's speeches which have been more frequently quoted and criticised than this : nor have the comments

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, July 6, 1877, p. 327.

² *Ibid.* p. 331.

always been accurate as to the facts of the case. Until very recently, or perhaps to this day, it has been a commonplace of the extremer Protestant controversialists that the Primate had described *the Ritualistic Party* as "conspirators"; and pamphlets and leaflets with such a statement at their head have obtained wide currency and credence.¹ It has here been shown what he actually said. As regards the men, whether clergy or laity, who were deliberately inculcating such a system of Confession as is set forth in *The Priest in Absolution*, and the series of *Books for the Young*, his words were stern and uncompromising. But it was to this particular system only that he applied the term "conspiracy"; and, as so applied, he absolutely refused to withdraw or modify it.

It will remain a matter of opinion whether the infliction of the pain which his words undoubtedly caused was wise and salutary, or the reverse. It was his own belief, often repeated, that on such an occasion he had practically no alternative. His opinions on the subject were clear and deliberate. He had the concurrence, tacit or outspoken, of all his brother Bishops, and his responsible duty to the Church of which he was chief minister required him, as he believed, to speak his mind frankly upon a question of such vital consequence. It was certainly not lightly or inconsiderately that he did so, and, as was to be expected, a large correspondence immediately ensued. Dr. Pusey and other leading Confessors wrote at once to remonstrate. One of the points urged by Dr. Pusey was the great advantage experienced among school-boys from the systematic use of Auricular Confession. "I have this morning," he said, "received, in consequence of the discussions in Convocation, the following statistics [respecting]

¹ In 1884 the Church Association, having had its attention called to the inaccuracy of the supposed quotation, withdrew, or materially modified, the form of the announcement on the leaflets in question.

a large school." The statistics tabulated on a system of percentage the benefit which had come to one hundred boys from the use of Confession. The Archbishop, in thanking him, asked for some fuller information about the school, and inquired under what influence it was that one hundred boys had been in the habit of coming to Confession. Dr. Pusey replied :—

"All which I know about the statistics which I sent your Grace is that they were contained, I am told, in a letter from the Chaplain of one of the largest of our Church schools. How so many as one hundred came to use Confession, I know not, for I know not the school." . . . "If purity were more preached at public schools, it would help much. A clergyman, who had been a boy at Winchester, said to me, 'We cannot say what we owe to Dr. Moberly. He used to preach purity, purity, purity.'"

It is curious to notice this testimony, in connection with the words of Dr. Moberly, as quoted above, expressing his dislike and dread of the introduction into schools of the very system Dr. Pusey was recommending.

During the next few weeks, many priests who heard and recommended habitual Confession, and many men and women who made such confessions, protested to the Archbishop, in distress or wrath, against the language he had used.

Some of them declared their firm assurance, based on long personal experience, that by discouraging the use of the Confessional in the Church of England he was placing a terrible obstacle in the way of the growth of the spiritual life. He was assured, by one well-known parish priest of wide experience, that "without the habitual use of the Confessional for young and old, the ministry which we discharge would be deprived of half its power." Another, scarcely less prominent, maintained that the charges the Archbishop had made were intolerable, because, in the nature of things, they admitted of no reply. Priest-

confessors, he argued, were prevented "by self-respect on the one hand and by the seal of Confession on the other" from stating, even to their Bishops, whether or not they were in the habit of asking such questions as had been referred to. "We have no right," he said, "to reveal to any man the sins, *or the class of sins*, that are actually brought to us in Confession; and to say how we deal with them would be to say what they are." How, in such circumstances, the exercise of any regulating authority could be even possible, the writer did not endeavour to explain, but obviously many of the letters, pamphlets, and even sermons, which were put forth, had their origin in an excitement and indignation which were not unnatural on the part of men who found themselves accused, in a coarse and violent manner, of wrong-doing of the grossest sort, the accusation proceeding from partisan speakers and writers, who tried to justify their cruel and unsparing language by a distorted reference to what the Bishops had felt it right to say. Having spoken his mind fully and decisively, the Archbishop declined to be led by his correspondents into further personal discussion of the question. Several ladies wrote to him, beseeching him to withdraw his words of condemnation from the priests under whose direction they had placed themselves and their families, and re-opening at great length the whole question of the use of the Confessional. To most of these he replied in almost identical terms:—

" LAMBETH PALACE, S.E., *July* 1877.

"MY DEAR MADAM,—I thank you for your letter. You will not, I think, expect me to enter at length into the subject of Confession, on which, as you are aware, I have recently spoken very fully. I must ask you to remember that the resolutions of the Bishops, to which you refer, were directed against a particular book—which, in the opinion of all the Bishops, contains teaching foreign to the doctrine of the Church of England.

"I enclose for your careful perusal a copy of the 'Declaration of the Bishops on the subject of Confession,' an expression of opinion not lightly or hurriedly made, but deliberately setting forth what is 'the teaching of the Church of England on the subject of Confession,' in the judgment of the Bishops whom God has placed in authority in that Church. This Declaration was confirmed and indorsed a few weeks ago by the Lower House of Convocation. If in the face of this deliberate and authoritative exposition of the teaching of our Church, contrary doctrines and practices continue to be inculcated by her accredited ministers, you cannot, I think, be surprised that the Bishops should speak of such conduct with reprobation.—I remain, dear Madam, yours very faithfully,

. "A. C. CANTUAR."

It is not the business of this biography to discuss the character or extent of the influence exercised, or the change effected, by these Episcopal declarations. From the first the Archbishop had seen clearly that the question would not be speedily settled. "It has raised a storm in the Church of England," he wrote in his Diary, "of which we shall not see the end for many a long day." So many of the brethren resigned their position in the Society after the debates in Convocation, that for some time it seemed probable that the Society itself would be dissolved, in accordance with the expressed wish of several of its members. The Archbishop was in frequent correspondence on the subject with Canon Carter and others, but he left it to the authorities of the Society to decide upon their own course of action, and although more than one of the resignations was due to his suggestion or request, he never took the formal step adopted by some of his brother Bishops, who announced that they would decline to institute or license in their dioceses any member of the Holy Cross Society.

It was naturally among those clergy whose daily work in overcrowded and poor parishes brought them into con-

tact with the grossest forms of vice, that the Society and its book found their boldest champions. One or two of these priests sent to the Archbishop detailed accounts of their experiences, and indignantly asked whether, while these horrible sins went on, the only people blamed and hindered were to be those who were endeavouring to understand or grapple with the evil. "Knowing what I do," says one of these writers, "of the extent of impurity, and the remedy for it that Confession is, it is impossible to wonder that the devil should strive to wall-up Bethesda, and tell the sick man he has no business to want any man to help him."

"While the public," writes another, "incited by our Bishops and noblemen, are holding up their hands with horror at the bare idea of our 'tampering with these things,' what of the *things* themselves, which are eating like a cancer into the heart of society, high and low, and draining the manliness out of the hearts of English men, and the purity out of the hearts of English women? . . . I am bold enough to pray your Grace and the other Bishops, not only not to condemn, but, on the contrary, publicly to affirm the necessity for the proper and discreet use by the ministers of God's Word, of some such work as *The Priest in Absolution*, if they are to grapple with, instead of ignoring, the incursions of deadly sins into the flock of Christ."

To the writers of such letters, and they were many, the Archbishop replied in almost every case by asking the brave and earnest man who was struggling, with whatever weapons, against these foes, to come and talk the matter quietly over, and in at least one instance the issue of the conversation was a frank and grateful acknowledgment that the Archbishop's words had thrown "an entirely new light upon the problems in their wider aspect."

"I went to Lambeth," he says, writing some time afterwards, "bubbling over with an indignant certainty that the Archbishop had taken a bigoted and one-sided view of a question which I

necessarily understood far better than he did. I was with him for nearly an hour, and, before I left, the whole looked different. He had shown me the wider issues involved in the principles and practice I was following; and his fatherly counsel came to me then, and comes back to me still, like a whiff of fresh air in a stuffy room."

CHAPTER XXIV.

THE PUBLIC WORSHIP REGULATION ACT.

1874.

"HOW does it happen that the wisest and most respected of your Bishops is the author of the most unpopular, ridiculous, and unworkable of modern Acts of Parliament?" This question was asked by a distinguished American Churchman, who visited England in 1878; and whatever opinion may be held as to the truth or strength of his epithets, it is clear that a similar thought has at times suggested itself to many other men who have tried to understand the English Church history of the present generation. Let any one look, for example, at the obituary memoirs of Archbishop Tait, which filled the Christmas newspapers of 1882. There is scarcely one of them which does not allude prominently to the Public Worship Regulation Act in connection with the policy and purpose of his public life. Sometimes it is mentioned in his praise, sometimes with surprise or blame. But there it stands, described, according to the sympathies of the writer, either as a strange excrescence of wanton bigotry and unwisdom, which mars the even tenor of his statesmanship and his common sense, or as a notable and noble evidence of his genuine Protestant sympathies and his hatred of Popery in all its forms. It would be difficult perhaps to say which of these criticisms is the less applicable to the facts of the case.

It will be the aim of this chapter, at the risk of being tedious to some readers, to tell with such detail as may be necessary for clearness what was the Archbishop's share in passing the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874. The biographer, who has before him the voluminous correspondence of that year, and of the year which preceded it, is struck, above all else, by the contrast between the view taken then and subsequently of the attempted legislation. Circumstances which may almost be called accidental have, in recent years, given to this particular Act an importance out of all proportion to its direct power either of good or ill, and it is abundantly clear, on the evidence for example of such newspaper extracts as are above referred to, that the history and intention of the measure have been, so far as the public is concerned, in part forgotten and in part misunderstood.

Reference has been made in a former chapter to the tedious and unsatisfactory litigation of previous years upon the Ritual question, to the protests and counter-protests which followed upon the decisions of the Courts, the vehement memorials on either side and the replies they had received, the admitted mischiefs and uncertainties of the existing law, and the futile attempts of Lord Shaftesbury and others to set them right in Parliament. Let any one consider the encouragement given by these useless strifes to a spirit of petty partisanship and litigiousness, as well as the unsettlement and waste of time which they involved, and he will admit that whatever faults the light of after history may have revealed in the ecclesiastical legislation of 1874, that legislation cannot fairly be described either as inspired by an unreasoning panic or as undertaken with reckless precipitancy.

The subject of the Church's Courts was one which bristled with difficulties, and any legislator, clerical or lay,

who endeavoured without destroying the ancient character of these Courts to simplify and smooth their wearisome complications, found himself confronted by opponents on both sides, opponents who had nothing in common but a determination to frustrate any and every attempt at reform which should be undertaken on lines other than their own. On the one hand were those who argued that any reform of the Courts of the Church must be by ecclesiastical canon alone, duly "promulged and put in ure," and that it would be far better to leave them unreformed than to let Parliament lay upon them its sacrilegious hand. On the other hand were those who regarded as an exploded superstition the notion of any real distinction between ecclesiastical and civil courts, and who ascribed to clerical stupidity and prejudice, if not to something worse, any reference to the rights of Convocation, or the power of canon law. "Convocation, my lords, convocation is all fudge," exclaimed one of these leaders in the course of a memorable debate, and though the words do not appear in the corrected report in *Hansard*, they gave terse expression to a feeling very widely shared. Of this type of ecclesiastical reformer Lord Shaftesbury was the foremost specimen. He had spent his life in combating abuses, and, in his opinion, the same sort of drastic legislation, which, in defiance of 'vested interests' and 'the customs of the trade,' had rescued chimney-sweepers and factory children, might be applied with good effect to the abuses of the laws ecclesiastical, bolstered up, as he believed them to be, by 'customs' scarcely more defensible than those against which he had wielded his broadsword so effectively in other fields. Year after year, as we have seen, he had introduced a Bill to sweep away the "clumsy anachronisms" of the existing Courts, and to set them upon a new footing more consonant with

what he deemed the spirit of the age.¹ The Archbishop, it will be remembered, had to a certain extent co-operated in some of these attempts ; but Lord Shaftesbury, with all his enthusiasm, was not an easy man to work with, and the success which had attended so many of his exploits made him impatient of the slightest interference on the part of his friends with plans which he had once matured. It was certain that if the necessary changes were to win the support of Churchmen generally, they must emanate from some one else than Lord Shaftesbury. Most people felt that if such legislation was to be introduced at all it was from the Episcopal benches in the House of Lords that it ought to emanate, and this obvious responsibility was made all the greater by the opposition which had been offered, in that quarter, to some of Lord Shaftesbury's proposals. A pledge had been virtually given that the authorities of the Church would themselves undertake the introduction of some plan which should, if possible, effect in a conciliatory way such reforms as Lord Shaftesbury's rougher efforts had striven in vain to bring about. The pledge had been given, and it had now to be fulfilled. Accordingly, on January 12 and 13, 1874, the Bishops of both Provinces met at Lambeth in full force, and decided upon immediate action. A Bill was to be drafted in the first instance by the two Archbishops, who were to endeavour, in framing its provisions, to make them accord, so far as possible, with the advice which Convocation had given four years before.

Wide differences of opinion were of course foreseen respecting the details of the proposed procedure, but no one seems at first to have anticipated that any fundamental objection to the passing of such a Bill was likely to be raised on the part of those friendly to the Church.

¹ See above, pp. 110-115.

In the angry months that followed it was frequently assumed, and even asserted, by controversialists that the only wish for legislation had emanated from a few partisan Bishops who had no sympathy with the aims of the High Church party, and were irritated by its growing influence and success. Such an assertion could find acceptance only with the prejudiced or the uninformed. Again and again the two Archbishops, to whom their brethren had intrusted the drafting of the Bill, called attention to the significant fact that they were acting in the name of a practically unanimous Episcopate. Indeed, it would seem that the single Bishop who thought the introduction of such a measure undesirable based his argument not on any objection to the principle of the Bill, but on the fear that, if introduced from the Episcopal Bench, it would, on that very ground, be defeated in Parliament. And with regard to the original intention of the measure, it is scarcely possible to suppose that a course of action which had received the approval of such men as Bishops Wordsworth, Selwyn, Harold Browne, Moberly, Durnford, and Goodwin, could be regarded by honest critics as directed against the interests or the principles of loyal High Churchmen. To judge, in fact, from the Archbishop's correspondence at the time, it would seem to have been the general feeling that, if any apology was required, it was for the long delay which had occurred in giving effect to the request made by Convocation some four years before in favour of legislation "for facilitating, expediting, and cheapening proceedings in enforcing clergy discipline."

The strange misconceptions which marked its progress from the outset make it important to see clearly what was the actual form in which the two Archbishops first prepared their Bill. Its provisions were briefly as follows :—

In every Diocese in England a Council or Board of Assessors was to be formed, under the presidency of the Bishop, consisting of three incumbents and five lay Churchmen, elected respectively by the clergy and the churchwardens of the Diocese, such elected members holding office for five years, in addition to the Chancellor, the Dean, and the Archdeacon, who were to sit *ex officio*. Any complaint made to the Bishop as to ritual irregularity might be referred by him to this Council, which should, if necessary, hear evidence, and advise the Bishop whether, in the light of local circumstances, it seemed desirable that further proceedings should be taken. In the event of the Bishop being advised to proceed, he was to issue such admonition or order, if any, as he deemed necessary, and this order was to have the force of law unless the clergyman affected should himself appeal to the Archbishop against it. The Archbishop was in person to hear the appeal, and to determine, with the aid of his Vicar-General, whether the Bishop's admonition should be confirmed or annulled. From the Archbishop's decision thus given there was under this Bill to be no appeal either to the Privy Council or elsewhere.

Such, in outline, was the proposed measure. It was drawn with the utmost care, so as to avoid the introduction of any principle foreign to the rules of the Book of Common Prayer, as laid down in the Preface "Concerning the Service of the Church."¹ It aimed at reviving in a practical shape the *forum domesticum* of the Bishops, with just so much of coercive force added as seemed necessary to meet the changed circumstances of modern times, and perhaps to meet also the novel view which had come to be adopted in some quarters with respect to the obligations attaching to the ordination oath of Canonical Obedience.

That such a measure should become law without active opposition in Parliament was not to be expected ; perhaps, considering the strength which comes from criticism, was

¹ The concluding sentence from the Preface was recited in full in the original preamble as a practical key to the whole enactment.

scarcely even to be desired. But if the Archbishops had been able to show that they were supported by the clergy generally, without distinction of party, in their endeavour to provide for the effective exertion within due limits of such a restraining and moderating influence as seems to many to belong inherently to the Episcopal office, there is no reason to doubt that they might have carried through Parliament, in spite of opposition, a measure based upon these lines, and that much of the subsequent heartburning and strife would have been thereby avoided. This was what Archbishop Tait at least hoped for, and, in forecasting his difficulties, he evidently had less fear of any organised opposition from High Churchmen than of the obstacles which would be interposed in Parliament from the precisely opposite quarter to a measure so studiously moderate in design.

And the Parliamentary obstacles, certain at any time, were greatly aggravated by the political changes which were at that moment taking place. When, in the second week of January, the Bishops resolved to introduce a Bill, Mr. Gladstone was Prime Minister, Parliament was to meet on February 5, and Convocation the following week. Political feeling was at the moment running high, and it was thought by some that the strife and recrimination of the coming session were likely to be too fierce to allow of much attention being paid in Parliament to things ecclesiastical. Suddenly, on January 24, Mr. Gladstone dissolved Parliament, and appealed to the country. Three weeks later he had been hopelessly defeated at the polls, and Mr. Disraeli had taken his place as Premier, with the certainty of a large majority in the House of Commons.

How would the new Parliament—how, above all, would the new Cabinet, regard the proposals of the Bishops? Little as there was in these proposals to arouse keen

antagonism, it was not to be expected that a Cabinet containing Lord Cairns, Lord Salisbury, and Mr. Disraeli himself would have a complete unity of view as to the best solution of the Church's difficulties. No one, however, knew better than Archbishop Tait the necessity of enlisting, as far as possible, the co-operation of politicians in such an endeavour as that on which the Bishops had entered. The scheme was accordingly submitted in rough outline, not only to Mr. Disraeli, but to Lord Cairns, Lord Salisbury, Lord Shaftesbury, Mr. Beresford Hope, and other lay Churchmen whose opinion as to its Parliamentary possibilities and its general expediency was likely to be of value. Needless to say there was among these counsellors a very wide difference of opinion upon details, and even if the plan, of which so many were now aware, could have been kept, at its then stage, from becoming public property, it is probable that some modifications might have been necessary in the light of the free criticism it had received. The original intention of the Bishops had been that the whole scheme should be presented to Convocation at the same time as to Parliament,—not for detailed discussion, but that the Lower House might be formally and fully informed of the extent to which the Bishops had found themselves able to adopt the recommendations embodied in its report, to which allusion has been already made. This intention was frustrated by the unexpected dissolution. When the new Convocation had been elected, Lent intervened, and it was impossible to summon the Houses for business until after Easter. The Bishops were therefore unfortunately deprived at first of any real opportunity of explaining the intention and purport of the Bill. But the Press was wakeful, and in the lull before the newly elected Parliament met for business, the public were put in pos-

session of the whole plan. Critics sprang up at once on every side. Dr. Pusey sounded the tocsin of alarm, and in a series of vigorous letters to *The Times*¹ denounced the scheme as a mere endeavour to enforce against loyal High Churchmen the recent 'Purchas' judgment, which, as he maintained, was still liable, and even likely, to be reversed when it should again come before the Courts.

"The main object of the plan," he said, "is, I understand, to give the Bishops power to enforce summarily, by sequestration or other penalties, the late decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But five of the points upon which that Committee decided are at this moment subjects of litigation, and may come before the new final Court of Appeal. That Court of Appeal does not come into existence before November next. The new final Court may reverse, in some of these points (so lawyers tell us), the decisions of the old Court. It would be contrary to English sense of justice to enforce decisions against which an appeal was at that moment lying. We have resisted those decisions (some of us, at least) because they were given in an undefended suit, with (it appeared on the face of the judgment) an evident bias, and they have been pronounced by good legal authority to be bad in law. But there was no way of testing this, except by acting contrary to them, and taking the consequences. Resistance has had its natural result—fresh prosecutions. I have looked upon these prosecutions with satisfaction, in the hope that they might issue in a judgment which, from its evident impartiality and knowledge of the facts, may command respect. The new Court is much larger, and has a distincter legal element than the old. But legislation to enforce a judgment which may be in part reversed, in part, if confirmed by the new Court, acquiesced in, is manifestly absurd."

And again in a subsequent letter—

"Legal injustice (though committed through ignorance in an undefended suit) fosters, though it does not justify, disregard of law altogether." . . . "When this new Court of Appeal shall (as I doubt not that it will) pronounce dispassionately with (what the

¹ March 19, 24, and 30.

Judicial Committee had not) a full knowledge of the facts before them, the younger Ritualists will, I trust, acquiesce in the limits of a moderate ritual, and excesses will drop off of themselves, or by the revived influence of the Bishops. Some of our Bishops have been in an unnatural position towards us. When they shall no longer feel constrained by their own respect for a judicial sentence, and when that ill-advised petition of the 483 shall be forgotten, the Bishops will, I doubt not, be influenced by their own feeling, and by a sense of their spiritual office, to resume their fatherly relation to all their clergy, and we shall again rejoice to think and speak of them as 'fathers in God.' God, the great Father of all, will, I hope, 'turn the hearts of the fathers to the children and hearts of the children to the fathers.'"

Other correspondents followed suit, and before the plan thus suddenly made public had even been explained by its Episcopal sponsors, the flag of earnest resistance had been hoisted by the High Church party, who persuaded themselves that they saw in the Archbishops' Bill an intention to reduce the necessarily varied ritual of the Church to a dead level of monotonous uniformity. In vain the Archbishop tried by private letters to allay the storm, and to explain that he had no intention whatever of tampering, as his critics supposed, with the rubrics or the existing law. Writing, for example, to Lord Salisbury, on March 18, he says :—

"We do not propose to refer to the Diocesan Council any question as to Law, but simply whether, looking to the circumstances of the parish respecting which there is complaint, the Bishop ought to issue a monition. I think a duly chosen diocesan body may be trusted to exercise a wise discretion."

It is curious to notice that the point on which objectors mainly fastened at the first was the establishment of the Diocesan Council—precisely the provision which, if adopted, would have tended, whether rightly or wrongly, to render impossible the suits which have since been

most generally condemned. The Archbishop was not prepared to give up this Council without a struggle. But he was perfectly ready for any reasonable modification of its proposed action or constitution. On March 23 he writes as follows to Lord Shaftesbury :—

“The Bill does not contemplate the establishment of a new Court. Our object is to give effect to those rubrics which vest in the Ordinary the regulation of changes in public worship, and it has been thought that this discretion will be more satisfactorily exercised if the Bishops do not act by themselves, but with the assistance of a body of clergy and laity fairly chosen to represent the feelings of the Church. . . . No disputed points of law will come before [this body], and it is not proposed that counsel shall be heard. . . . It seems vital that certain laymen shall be members of the Bishops’ Council, and if the mode of election by churchwardens is objected to, it would be very important to suggest some other. Dr. Pusey’s objection to churchwardens as electors seems to prove too much, because if they are not fit even to elect such a Council, they can scarcely be fit to exercise their office in their respective parishes, and it may be taken as an indication that they would not be a very bad body of electors that they are objected to on the two different sides for opposite reasons. At the same time, it would be very valuable to hear the suggestions of any other feasible mode of selecting a fair representation of the laity.”¹

Objections, however, continued to flow in from opposite quarters, High Churchmen contending that universal and unending litigation would be set on foot to counteract an evil which, if not wholly imaginary, was very nearly so ; Low Churchmen urging that the provisions of the Bill were so mild and so restricted that it would in practice prove inoperative, and that something much more drastic

¹ This letter, and the fact to which it calls attention, appear to have been overlooked by Lord Shaftesbury’s biographer, who, in explanation of Lord Shaftesbury’s opposition to the proposed legislation says : “One of his principal objections was, that, according to the new measure, the proposed Court was to consist of ecclesiastics, with one exception nominated by the Bishops, and all subject to his authority.”—*Life of Lord Shaftesbury*, vol. iii. p. 345.

and severe was urgently required. Dean Close, for example, writes :—" Believe me, my dear and respected lord, a very much more radical measure will now alone satisfy the aroused and sensitive laity." Lord Shaftesbury and his friends were specially anxious that the Bill should not be limited to matters of Ritual, but should deal with other controverted practices, and, above all, with the Confessional. Writing on the 27th of March, Lord Shaftesbury says :—

" May I presume to observe that Ritualism and all its mischievous trumperies are now matters of secondary consideration? The Confessional is carrying the day, and unless the Church can cleanse herself of the foul thing, she and all her children will sink into the dust."

This request was again and again renewed, in Parliament and out of it, during the progress of the Bill, but the Archbishop set his face consistently against the endeavour, from whatever side, to import into the discussion these wider topics of erroneous or disputed teaching. The Bill drafted by the Bishops was limited to the single object of preventing tedious litigation and controversy about what they deemed the comparative trifles with which men's minds had been so unduly occupied, and it was of the very essence of their plan that the issue should be confined within these limits. The Diocesan Council was to take cognisance of overt acts of Ritual irregularity, but of nothing else ; for other matters the Church Courts lay open as before. But the alarm was not to be allayed, and once again, as in the Athanasian Creed controversy, men threatened a schism within the Church. A few days before the introduction of the Bill a prominent High Church peer wrote to warn the Archbishop distinctly that, quite apart from the precise provisions of the Bill—

"If any measure be carried, . . . some of the truest Churchmen will be driven into schism, as they would be perfectly ready to withdraw from a church whose connection with the State they already declare of doubtful advantage." He added that he did not see how he could himself "refuse to follow Dr. Pusey, or any other leading man, who, on the ground of new and oppressive legislation, left the Church."

It is not thus that thoughtful men are turned aside from action on which they have deliberately resolved, and the Archbishop still maintained his hope that when the intention and scope of the Bill had been explained, many who were now denouncing it and him would have their anger or their fears allayed. Its introduction had been postponed to the latest day compatible with a hope of its becoming law, in order to give time for the respectful consideration of any honest suggestion from whatever side, an opportunity of which the Archbishop's innumerable correspondents, lay and clerical, Protestant and Anglo-Catholic, availed themselves to the full.

At last, on April 20, he rose to explain to a crowded and expectant House the intention of the Bill. Not often of recent years have the galleries been more closely packed; never, it is said, were so many clergymen seen within the lobbies. Though he had been accustomed for many years to take a prominent part in debate, the Archbishop had never probably had to face a more difficult task than now. Five years before, in the struggle about the Irish Church, great issues had turned upon his speech, but at that time his line was clear, and he had only to give expression to a deliberate opinion which was not likely to be misunderstood. The circumstances were now altogether different. By a series, it may almost be said, of accidents, a measure neither ambitious nor far-reaching had been exaggerated by heated imagination and partisanship into a constitutional change of the first

magnitude. The Archbishop, in his opening speech, had to remove a double misconception. On the one hand, he had to disabuse his Evangelical friends of their hope that he would further 'Protestantise' the Church of England by an alteration of her Rubrics, and a new rigidity in their enforcement. On the other hand, he felt bound to show his High Church friends that he was not 'manufacturing' his grievance—that there was a real and admitted necessity that some action should be taken, and that some of the novel usages now becoming general were more significant, and therefore more important, than many moderate men supposed.

A few of his opening sentences will show his consciousness of the difficulty of his task :—

"My Lords, I have been requested by my right reverend brethren to bring under your Lordships' notice a subject which creates great interest in the country at the present time; and I have also been requested to close the remarks which I shall make to your Lordships by laying on the table the draft of a Bill which I hope may obtain acceptance. This measure is entitled 'An Act for the better administration of the Laws respecting the Regulation of Public Worship.' I must ask your Lordships' attention to the wording of this title. It is not our intention to propose to your Lordships any change in the laws ecclesiastical. . . . What we ask your Lordships to do is to remove certain difficulties in the way of the administration of those laws when clearly declared. My Lords, it has been said that we cannot touch this subject except in a one-sided manner—that the very touching of this matter has in itself a party aspect. I assure you it is the desire of the right reverend bench to approach this subject as free from party bias as possible; and I am sure your Lordships will be as anxious as we are that those who neglect to act up to laws, as was not uncommon in past times, should be obliged to obey those laws. I can remember when, in remote parishes, you might have found a very unseemly state of things—the minister scarcely attired as he should have been, the Holy Table used for singers, and the whole air and arrangements of the Church unbecoming a place

devoted to the worship of God. I am willing to believe that in the Church generally those irregularities have passed away; but if there be such things still, we are anxious that a remedy should be applied, and that the Bill which I shall lay upon the table should enforce a due and reverent celebration of the worship of God by those who have erred in a slovenly and imperfect mode of performing Divine Service. But it is in vain to conceal, either from your Lordships or from ourselves, that the necessity for this Bill comes from another quarter. The very cry which has been raised, that legislation on this subject must be one-sided, seems to show a consciousness on the part of those persons who utter it that they are not obeying the laws of the Church. Why otherwise should these persons say that those who are only anxious to have the laws of the Church obeyed must be taking a party view? . . . I have great difficulty in expressing in detail what is the character of these violations of the laws to which I allude, because, if I brought forward particular instances, I might be supposed to point invidiously to individuals, and far be it from me to hold up to the blame of your Lordships' House any one who, acting however mistakenly, is still acting conscientiously."

So far there was little in his speech to which exception could be taken. But, for the reasons above given, he thought it well to illustrate by examples the character of the irregularities which he desired to provide means of correcting—irregularities which, as he argued, were not (what they had been called) the mere eccentricities of a few unwise and obscure men, but were outward signs of a deliberate plan for changing the character and teaching of the public service of the Church of England. Obviously he was here treading upon dangerous ground. But he considered it both honest and wise to give such examples as should show that the Bishops were fully aware of the actual facts. As he afterwards pointed out to more than one correspondent, it was far better that these facts should be stated from the Episcopal bench than that they should be announced to the House from other quarters as an

argument for a more drastic measure, an argument which might, not improbably, prove successful. It was with this view that he referred to the growing circulation of certain large and ornamental altar-cards, printed for the use of the priest in celebrating the Holy Communion. On these cards, which were mounted as triptychs, to form a prominent part of the furniture of the Holy Table, the prayer of consecration, for audible use, was surrounded in print with devotions for the priest alone, quite alien to the tone and character of the Book of Common Prayer. He spoke of these cards as containing prayers

“which imply invocations to the Virgin Mary and the Twelve Apostles, to be said in a low tone during the Celebration of the Holy Communion. I only refer to these cards,” he continued, “to show that some of the things we have to deal with are of a very grave character. . . . I call upon those who glory in the name of members of the Church of England, who have no fellow-feeling for Puritanism in any form, but who have often fought the battles of the Church of England against the Church of Rome on the one hand, and against Puritanism on the other—who style themselves specially ‘Anglicans,’—I call upon them to come forward and declare themselves manfully against such a desecration of the Holy Communion as all Churchmen ought to unite in condemning.”

This statement about the altar-cards was not allowed, as will be seen, to pass unchallenged, and evoked an indignant protest from High Churchmen before many days had passed. In concluding his speech on the introduction of the Bill, the Archbishop stated what were the changes which it had been found necessary to make in the scheme originally proposed. Though considerable, they involved, he thought, nothing of vital moment. The objections which, to his surprise, had been raised from every quarter to the elected Diocesan Council of Commissioners or Assessors had forced him reluc-

tantly to give it up in the form proposed, and to fall back upon an alternative mode of appointing assessors, as provided in the Church Discipline Act passed thirty-four years before.¹ Again the hopes expressed even by High Churchmen as to the new Court of Appeal had encouraged him to accept the suggestion that to that Court, rather than to the Archbishop *in camera*, the incumbent who thought himself aggrieved should be allowed, in the last resort, to turn for a rehearing of his case. In making or accepting such changes as these, the Archbishop maintained the line he had from the first adopted, namely, that the precise details of the new system were of comparatively small importance, and that he was perfectly ready to modify them, provided only he could secure general support for some arrangement likely to prove simple in operation, so as to get the petty controversies settled, on which so much time and strength were, as he thought, being wasted. He scouted the idea that the Bill, as drafted, could by any possibility bring about such consequences as its opponents feared.

"My Lords, it has been said that we were coming to your Lordships' House to propose what would be a revolution in the Church of England. . . . If it be a revolution to put a stop quietly and speedily to the heartburnings now complained of, then we must plead guilty to our plan being one of revolution. The revolution we propose to bring about is one of those peaceful revolutions for which England is famous among nations—revolutions which have quietly removed proved abuses, and have saved many a venerable institution which might otherwise have been destroyed."

A few days later he was publicly challenged by Lord Nelson to substantiate in the House of Lords the charges

¹ The Assessors provided by that Act (3 and 4 Vict. c. 86, § 11), are the Dean, the Archdeacon, and either a sergeant-at-law or a barrister of seven years' standing.

he had made with respect to the character of the altar-cards in common use. In reply he quoted from an actual triptych, which had been sent to him by a firm of publishers as one which had a large and increasing sale. One of the prayers he referred to was as follows :—

“We offer to Thee this sacrifice of praise . . . for the hope of their salvation and safety who pay their vows to Thee, the eternal, living, and true God, joining in communion with and reverencing the memory firstly of the glorious and ever Virgin Mary . . . and also of Thy blessed Apostles and Martyrs, Peter, Paul, Andrew, . . . Linus, Cletus, Clement, Sixtus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Lawrence, Crysogonus, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian, and all Thy Saints, through whose merits and prayers vouchsafe that we may in all things be protected by the aid of Thy safeguard.”

He quoted also the following prayer from a book, the author of which claimed that his was the compilation from which all such altar-cards were taken :—

“ . . . I beg of Blessed Mary, ever Virgin, of Blessed Michael the Archangel, of Blessed John the Baptist, of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, of all the saints, and of you, my brethren, to pray to the Lord our God for me.”

“If that is not,” he continued, “an *ora pro nobis*, I do not understand the meaning of the English language, or of the Latin words which are on the other side. . . . I should be sorry to speak with harshness of any clergyman of the Church of England. We have heard a good deal about the desirableness of addressing paternal remonstrances. It certainly does seem to me that those who have been deceived into these practices have been led away by some unwise and to me unintelligible desire of uniting Christendom by adopting the worst errors of one branch of the Christian Church from which our Church is separated. But I would most earnestly call upon them, with whatever paternal authority my office vests in me, to think seriously of what they are doing, when, in the face of congregations of the Church of England, they venture to use the service of the Roman Mass, and give no security that when they are speaking in a low tone to themselves they are not directly addressing the Blessed Virgin

Mary, and invoking her prayers on behalf of the worshippers present—who, I believe, if they knew what the minister was saying, would rise and leave the church.”¹

The letters of the next fortnight showed conclusively that all hope of the concurrence of High Churchmen in passing the Bill through Parliament must be definitely abandoned. The statements made in the Archbishop's speech had served, whether reasonably or not, to inflame the extremest men; and after a few days it became evident that the old-fashioned and moderate High Churchmen, regarding the proposed legislation as dangerous or hopeless, had determined to join hands with its opponents. Their decision was a grave disappointment to the Archbishop, and was fruitful in its consequences upon the measure itself. Deserted or opposed by those on whose support they had, perhaps too confidently, counted, the Bishops were unable to hold their own against the threatened ‘amendment’ of their Bill from other quarters. Lent was now over, and on April 28 Convocation met. The tone of the discussions in the Lower House proved to the Archbishop that, if his Bill was to pass, it must be with the aid of other support than he had hoped for. In a formal document he requested the Lower House to inform him whether or not they adhered to the resolutions they had agreed to in 1869 in favour of legislation “for facilitating, expediting, and cheapening proceedings in enforcing clergy discipline.” The Lower House, after much debate, replied that they held to their former resolutions, but “objected to their partial application for the correction of a particular class of offences,” and again, a few days later, transmitted to the Upper House the Report of a Committee containing an expression of “deep regret that even with the

¹ *Hansard*, May 8, 1874, pp. 1923-5.

amendments suggested they are unable to recommend legislation in the manner proposed in the Bill." These resolutions were not arrived at in the Lower House without heated and acrimonious discussion. One very important resolution was carried only by the casting vote of the Prolocutor, and the debates revealed the widest diversity of opinion as to what the new legislation ought to be. On one point only was there practical unanimity—the absolute need of legislation of some sort. In opening the discussion, for example, the Prolocutor, speaking from the chair, expressed his earnest hope "that whatever else we may decide, we shall distinctly affirm that there is a grave necessity for legislation on the matters submitted to us."¹

And, again, the very member on whose motion the resolution of disapproval was carried, Prebendary Joyce, prefaced his speech as follows:—

"It is impossible to overrate the gravity of the crisis at which we have arrived. It is perfectly clear that there is a spirit of disobedience abroad amongst the clergy, and I do not hesitate to affirm that the time has come when it is absolutely essential that some remedy should be provided for the unfortunate existing state of things. In considering how this remedy is to be applied, it must be obvious to all that if this Lower House should interpose any *obex* or bar—if we should stand in the way of remedying such an evil—I am afraid it may be said: '*actum est de Ecclesia Anglicana.*'"²

These expressions of opinion, of which many other examples might be given, have an important bearing upon the Archbishop's determination to proceed with his endeavour, be the opposition as strenuous as it might.

On May 11 he moved the second reading in the House of Lords. A division had been anticipated, but though

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1874, p. 104.

² *Ibid.* April 29, 1874, p. 126.

Lord Salisbury, Lord Shaftesbury, Lord Nelson, and others, took exception to the measure from different points of view, they declined at the last moment to divide the House against it, and, after a debate of seven hours, it was read a second time. The Whitsuntide recess which followed gave scanty breathing-space either to the friends or the opponents of the Bill. The following letter to a friend gives a sketch of what the Archbishop's work had been :—

“STONEHOUSE, May 23, 1874.

“ . . . This Bill has been a serious business. . . . [We had in January] to draw it up : then to bring the Ministry to agree with us : then to sound the general public by various correspondence : then to modify the Bill to meet the views of Dizzy and Cairns : then to persuade our brethren again to accept the amended Bill : then to introduce it in Parliament : then to fight through Convocation : then to coax and argue with the Evangelicals on one side, and the E. C. Union on the other : then to take it up again in Parliament : then to listen to all the proposed amendments : and here we are now, having begun operations in January, and having reached the last week in May, having carried the second reading, and waiting for the Committee in the Lords, with the House of Commons looming in the distance. Certes, it is no easy matter to carry any legislation in a free country ! Still things look promising, if we are not defeated by the tactics of delay. Meanwhile Mr. Holt's two Bills, of a much more stringent character, are coming on the Commons, and the Ritualists may fall into worse hands than ours.”

Mr. Holt, a member of the Church Association, had obtained promises of wide support for a Bill of his own devising, which had been read a first time in the House of Commons on May 4. His object was to provide a simple and summary mode of immediate suspension and deprivation by the Diocesan Chancellor (who must necessarily be a barrister) for any clergyman who had introduced unlawful usages, and who was not prepared to

promise their immediate discontinuance. The proposal was of the most 'rough and ready' kind, but it was far from being certain, in the then temper of the House of Commons, that it would, for that reason, fail to be supported. Undeterred by the prospect of such an alternative, the opponents of the Archbishops' Bill grew in courage and coherence, and stormy meetings to denounce the Episcopal measure were held in London and elsewhere. In the House of Lords a division was challenged by the Duke of Marlborough on the motion to go into Committee on the Bill. He was supported by only twenty-seven lay peers and by one Bishop,¹ the numbers on the other side being 137, including 19 Bishops, among whom were the two Primates and the Bishops of London, Winchester, Rochester, Peterborough, Chichester, Exeter, and Carlisle.² The Bishops of Lincoln and Oxford declined to vote on either side.

The Bill now safely in Committee, the Archbishops had to face quite a shoal of amendments put forward by various sections of the House. Though the notices of these amendments filled more than forty folio pages, three only were of great importance. The Bishop of Peterborough proposed to lay down what was described as a "neutral zone" of practices, which, whether strictly legal or not, should by common consent be placed outside the category of acts for which prosecution was possible.³ Although he

¹ Bishop Moberly of Salisbury, who had originally, it would seem, been in favour of the Bill, but thought it undesirable to persevere in face of the existing agitation.

² *i.e.* Bishops Jackson, Harold Browne, Claughton, Magee, Durnford, Temple, and Goodwin.

³ The following were the suggested *exciptenda*—(1) the position of the celebrant during the prayer of consecration; (2) the separate use of the words of administration; (3) the use of hymns; (4) evening communion; (5) sermons apart from Divine service; (6) daily prayer; (7) use of the Communion Service. To this list Lord Stanhope proposed to add "the use of the Athanasian Creed."

had received the assurance of considerable and weighty support, the Bishop found it necessary in the end to withdraw this amendment, mainly on account of the controversy which would evidently be raised as to including within the neutral zone the rubric directing the use of the Athanasian Creed.

Lord Selborne's group of amendments gave effect still more markedly than the original Bill to the direction contained in the Prayer Book for the "appeasing of doubts" by recourse to the Bishop. He proposed that a formal monition issued by the Bishop, whether *mero motu* or at the instance of complainants, should be effective in law unless objected to within fourteen days. Difficulties were, however, raised as to the working of this plan, and, in the result, to the disappointment of very many, it was rejected without a division.

The amendments standing in the name of Lord Shaftesbury were by far the most important on the list. It was a subject on which he had a right to speak. Year after year he had brought forward his proposals for the reconstruction of the Courts from top to bottom, and however rough or drastic his scheme might appear, it was known to be the handiwork of one of the ablest ecclesiastical lawyers of the day, Dr. Archibald Stephens. One of Lord Shaftesbury's principal aims was the practical ousting of clerical judges, and the substitution of laymen in their room. He made no secret of his view that the Archbishops' Bill missed the very point for which he cared most. In the debate upon its second reading he had described it as "so much waste paper," and he now moved a series of amendments for the insertion of certain clauses taken from his own Bills of a few years before. These clauses transferred to a single lay judge, to be appointed by the two Archbishops, the office and authority

of the two existing Provincial judges, and directed that this judge should hear all representations under the Act, without the intervention either of Diocesan Courts, or of the preliminary commission of inquiry proposed by the Archbishops.

Clearly these amendments, if adopted, would alter the whole character of the proposed legislation, and it is abundantly evident that if, without Lord Shaftesbury's aid, they had been able to carry their Bill on its original lines, the Archbishops would have declined to accept the suggested change. But in the absence of external support from the main body of High Churchmen, this was no longer possible, and they were thus face to face with a grave alternative. Either they must, at whatever cost, refuse the amendment, or, by accepting and incorporating it, they must become nominally responsible for provisions which, as they foresaw, might give rise in the end to a wider dissatisfaction than had been yet aroused.

Looking back now across the intervening years, and recollecting all the difficulties, real or imaginary, which have turned upon the position and authority of the judge appointed under the provisions of Lord Shaftesbury's clauses, most critics have found no difficulty in deciding off-hand that the first of these courses would have been 'obviously' the wiser, and that the acceptance of an amendment so irritating to the High Church party was too heavy a price to pay even for securing what had been intended as a peaceful solution of the strife. But at the moment these facts were not by any means so obvious as they may now appear. In the first place, no one, it would seem, attached to this new clause, at the time, the character it afterwards acquired. So far was it from being then regarded by High Churchmen as

an additional grievance, that Lord Bath, who represented their interests in the House of Lords, joined with Lord Salisbury and Lord Selborne in both speaking and voting in its favour. And there was a further point of even more practical importance. Not till the very evening of the debate did the Archbishop become aware that the clauses in question, though standing in Lord Shaftesbury's name, had been actually amended and indorsed by no less a man than Lord Chancellor Cairns himself. A majority in favour of the amendment was therefore certain.¹ Absolutely to refuse the amendment in such circumstances was to abandon the Bill, and, after what had passed, the abandonment of the Bill by the Bishops meant, in all probability, the immediate introduction under the auspices of Lord Shaftesbury and Lord Cairns of a new Bill far less tolerable to High Churchmen than anything that had yet been proposed. The House of Commons, it was known, was very ready for such legislation, and, had the endeavour been successful to procure the abandonment of the Archbishops' Bill in favour of other and more severe legislation, it is impossible to estimate what might have been the consequences to the Church and to the country. There was less than an hour in which to decide the question, and after such consultation as was possible during the actual debate, the Archbishops resolved to speak against the new clauses, but to accept them on division if it should become inevitable, and thus to retain their control over the subsequent conduct of the Bill, and especially over the clause which gave to each Bishop the power of absolute veto upon the commence-

¹ In Lord Shaftesbury's *Life*, vol. iii. p. 347, occurs the following extract from his diary at the time :—May 26, 1874 : " Had resolved to abandon Bishops' Bill altogether. But Cairns besought me—*promising me privately the whole support of the Government*—to bring forward as an amendment a large portion of my former Ecclesiastical Courts Bill. Agreed, as he wished it, but, I fear, to my vast trouble and even confusion."

ment of proceedings within his diocese. On a division being taken fifteen Bishops (including the two Archbishops, both of whom had spoken against the change) reluctantly voted in favour of accepting the new clauses rather than abandon the Bill. Only two Bishops¹ voted upon the other side, and Lord Shaftesbury's clauses were adopted by 112 votes to 13. On the question of the episcopal veto, which was raised a few nights later, the Archbishop entirely refused to give way. Lord Shaftesbury wrote to him privately, expressing his strong disapproval of the clause, and his intention to protest against it, and other influential correspondents took the same line,² but the Archbishop would have preferred the defeat of his plan to the abandonment of this clause, to which he always referred in later years as of the very essence of the Bill; and in spite of the combined opposition of Lord Shaftesbury and Lord Salisbury,³ he succeeded in securing a power which was afterwards to prove an effective weapon in his hands for preventing vexatious litigation both in his own diocese and elsewhere. After five long nights in Committee, the Bill was, on June 25, read a third time without a division, and sent down to the Commons. The Government had as yet given the measure no official support, and some of its members had made no secret of their opposition. The Archbishop thought it right, in

¹ The Bishops of Oxford and Carlisle.

² One dignitary, for example, wrote, "Much as I approve of your Bill, I would far rather struggle on as we are than give this discretionary power to the Bishops."

³ It is curious to notice that, at this stage in the controversy, the opposition to the Episcopal veto was confined to no one party in the Church. It is strongly objected to in a petition to Parliament, promoted by High Churchmen, in which, together with other objections as to the rights of the priesthood, the privileges of Convocation, and the like, it is urged against the Bill that "instead of providing that all and every clerk complained against should be brought to trial in due form of law, the Bill leaves within the absolute and unfettered decision of each Bishop whether or not such complaint shall be proceeded with."

these circumstances, to lay once more before the Prime Minister his own view of the case :—

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to the
Right Hon. B. Disraeli.*

“ LAMBETH PALACE, 8th July 1874.

“ MY DEAR MR. DISRAELI, . . . [Allow me to] state to you the reasons which make it, in my opinion, highly inexpedient that the Public Worship Regulation Bill should fail to pass this Session.

“ The agitation of the subject for another year would, in my judgment, be injurious to the Church. The excitement always caused, when such discussion is inevitable, is perilous, and the excitement increases by delay. The whole summer, if the Bill were rejected, would be occupied by meetings of the contending parties, whereas, if the Bill passes, I believe its real character will at once become apparent. . . . The postponement of the Bill would be regarded as a great triumph for the violent party over the Bishops ; a reaction would immediately set in, and we should have as violent a Protestant storm as that conjured up by the Papal Aggression. The evil of allowing the law of the Church to remain powerless, and certain violent persons to continue a law to themselves, is obvious. . . . Yours sincerely,

“ A. C. CANTUAR.”

Mr. Disraeli gave a guarded reply, and promised his “best consideration of the circumstances.” The Bill was introduced by Mr. Russell Gurney in a quiet and conciliatory speech, and it at once became apparent that, notwithstanding the opposition of some of the leaders on both sides, the rank and file of the House of Commons were almost unanimous in their approval. Mr. Gladstone, to the embarrassment of his friends, reappeared from his retirement at Hawarden, armed with six weighty resolutions against the new legislation. His speech was of the highest interest and importance, but never, perhaps, in his long career did his eloquence so completely fail to enlist the sympathy even of his own followers.

Mr. Disraeli, who had at first taken a cautious and "impartial" line, on observing the unexpected fervour with which the House of Commons received the Bill, became himself enthusiastic in its favour, supporting it in an impassioned speech, as a Bill "to put down Ritualism." The phrase became a memorable one, and not that phrase alone, for the whole debates were noted for so free a licence of recrimination and invective among political friends that they have obtained a permanent place in our Parliamentary annals as an occasion

" When sharp and stinging
The angry words flew daily to and fro,
Friend against friend the polished missile flinging,
Each seeking who should launch the keenest blow."

Sir William Harcourt, in an incisive speech, cast ridicule and contempt on Mr. Gladstone's elaborate attack, and at a later stage of the discussion, in replying to Lord Salisbury, who was said¹ to have accused the House of Commons of carrying the Bill by a "blustering majority," Mr. Disraeli described his colleague as "a master of gibes and flouts and jeers." After two nights of such debate, the House of Commons read the Bill a second time without a division, and Mr. Gladstone's resolutions were somewhat ignominiously withdrawn.

Eye-witnesses have described the scene on the second night of the debate. The hour was late, and

"The House, jaded with a long and anxious sitting, was eager to divide. A clear voice made itself heard above the clamour; it was Mr. Hussey Vivian, an old and tried follower of Mr. Gladstone. 'He rose to warn him not to persevere with his resolutions; not twenty men on his own side of the House would follow him into the lobby.' Already deft lieutenants,

¹ Lord Salisbury subsequently explained that though he had used the word "bluster" with reference to the House of Commons, it had not been in the sense supposed.

mournful of aspect, had brought slips of paper to their chief, fraught, it seemed, with no good tidings. When the speaker put the question there was no challenge for a division! Amid the roar of mixed cheers and laughter the six resolutions melted away into darkness. They were formally withdrawn next day, and from that time Mr. Gladstone, yielding not ungracefully to the manifest determination of the House, abandoned his intention of contesting all the ground, and filled a useful place in the discussion.”¹

The following letter is important, as coming from one whose words were always weighty, and who, by the resignation of his see a few months before, had placed himself outside the arena of the strife :—

*Bishop Thirlwall (late of St. David's) to the
Archbishop of Canterbury.*

“59 PULTENEY STREET, BATH, 18th July 1874.

“MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,— . . . I may now perhaps venture to congratulate you on the substantial success of your Bill. Beside the immediate good effect which may be expected from it in checking the licence of innovation, it has brought to light some things which, antecedently to experience, could hardly have been believed, and which I regard as in the highest degree cheering and hopeful. I believe we should have to look back some centuries before we could find so animated a debate in the House of Commons on an ecclesiastical question. But that the Bill should have been read a second time without a division, and this notwithstanding Gladstone's opposition—which only served greatly to damage his reputation as a statesman—seems to me to have proved several things which could have been ascertained in no other way, *e.g.* the practically universal sense of the need of such a measure ; the unanimity of the country in its favour ; and, what is most important of all, the continued attachment of the great mass of the intelligent laity to the Church, as a Reformed Church, and the deep interest they feel in its welfare. So much I think may be fairly said, whether the Bill be improved or not as it passes through Committee. More

¹ See *Quarterly Review*, vol. cxxxvii. p. 576.

will depend on the way in which it is worked. I am afraid it is almost hopeless that the Bishops should come to a general understanding and agreement as to the exercise of their discretion. Of course it will not, and cannot, stand by itself; but I hope and trust will be so supplemented as to render your Primacy an ever-memorable and happy epoch in the History of the Church of England.

“Pray forgive my trespassing so long upon your patience, and believe me, my dear Archbishop, yours ever faithfully,

“CONNOP THIRLWALL, Bishop.”

When the Bill, on August 3, came back to the House of Lords, it had received only one alteration of importance. It will be remembered that a discretion had been given by the Bill to each Bishop to allow, or to refuse to allow, the Act to be put in motion in any particular case. The Commons, instigated, it may be, by Lord Shaftesbury, had taken strong exception to this provision, and had weighted or marred it by insisting on an appeal to the Archbishop for review of the Bishop's discretion. Mr. Gladstone had protested against this alteration, and had moved an amendment ‘on Report’ to restore the Bill to the condition in which the Lords had passed it. But he was defeated by an immense majority, and the Commons attached so much importance to their clause that Mr. Disraeli, as the following letter shows, deemed its final acceptance vital to the Bill:—

*The Right Hon. B. Disraeli to the Archbishop
of Canterbury.*

“*Confidential.*

August 3, 1874.

“MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,—If Mr. Gladstone's amendment is inserted by the Lords, the House of Commons will throw out the Bill. You may rely upon this. No combination between the Government and Mr. Gladstone could ensure success. There are 200 men who are prepared at a moment's notice to

return to town for this object, and their organisation is complete. I most earnestly recommend your Grace not to be indifferent to this warning, which comes from one who, from the first, has loyally helped you, and under immense difficulties.—Yours sincerely,
B. DISRAELI."

Archbishop Tait was not in favour of providing such an appeal as the Commons desired from the discretionary veto of each Diocesan Bishop. He had opposed the suggestion at an earlier stage in the discussions, but remembering, as he said, "the large number of matters in which such an appeal is provided by the existing law," he declared himself unable to regard the question as involving any important principle, and he was willing to accept the proposed appeal, little as he liked it, rather than risk, at this last moment, the rejection of the Bill, and the attendant consequences. On August 4 a sharp debate took place in the House of Lords with reference to the insertion of the proposed new clause, and the change was warmly opposed by the Bishop of Winchester and other Bishops, as well as by several lay peers, and was rejected on a division by 44 votes against 32.

When the Bill reached the House of Commons a second time, shorn of the one important amendment they had cared to insert, it seemed almost certain that Mr. Disraeli's warning would be fulfilled, and the Bill thrown out. But the Archbishop, mindful, it may be, of his successful intervention on a like occasion five years before, set himself, with the assistance of the Bishop of Winchester¹ and one or two others, to avert by per-

¹ Bishop Harold Browne, who had taken the lead in maintaining the independent right of each Diocesan Bishop to exercise his veto, subject to no appeal, was now so well satisfied that, on August 5, he wrote to the Archbishop: "I have done all I can, in the way of conversation and persuasion, to prevail on the persons to whom I have any influence to carry the Bill through the House of Commons."

sonal influence what he would have regarded as a real misfortune, and, to the surprise of his friends, his efforts proved a second time effectual. After a long and memorable debate, the Commons reluctantly consented to give way, and to leave the Diocesan discretion unfettered. The Bill was read a third time on August 5, and received the Royal assent a few days afterwards.

The Act, as finally passed, was certainly in its details a very different measure from that which had been drawn up by the two Archbishops at the request and with the counsel of their brethren six months before. At every stage it had undergone some change, and the Cairns-Shaftesbury amendment had given it an entirely novel colouring. But the main principles for which Archbishop Tait had from the first contended were still retained. The Act concerned itself with procedure only, and confined that procedure to a single and very limited class of alleged infractions of the law. It created no new offence. Nothing which had been lawful before became unlawful under its provisions. It left wholly untouched the pulpit and its teaching. For all matters of the graver kind, whether as to morals or doctrine, the law and its operation remained exactly as before. The Archbishop regarded it as the very essence of his legislation that the ritual irregularities or disputes with which alone the new Act was to deal should, if possible, be kept separate from these more fundamental questions. The new Act provided merely for the more ready hearing of such complaint as might be made by due authority in ritual causes which the Bishop had, on *prima facie* grounds, allowed to go forward. It suggested the arbitrament of the Bishop as the readiest and most orthodox mode of solving ritual disputes, and if (and only if) this arbitrament should be declined, it provided for the hearing of the case by a

single court instead of three courts in succession, there being an appeal to the Queen in Council under either Act.

And more than this, while its aim was to shorten and simplify a machinery which had been found almost unworkable, it was distinctly more lenient in operation, even within its own limited field, than the then existing law. For example, it required that the complaint as to irregularity should be made by at least three *bond fide* parishioners, members of the Church of England, whereas the former Act had allowed proceedings to be instituted by any person whatever, whether parishioner or no.¹ Again, under the previous law a ritual offence, once committed, was punishable by the Court, even though it should never be repeated. Under the new Act no past irregularity, even if proved, was punishable, the only punishable offence being the neglect to obey the monition issued by the Court for the discontinuance of the proved irregularity. And, most important of all, provision was now specifically made giving the Bishop a power of absolute veto on the commencement of proceedings. It has since been decided that this power might legitimately be exercised by the Bishop, even under the previous law; but it had never been specifically enacted, and the opposition which the new provision evoked is an evidence of the importance attached to it both by its friends and by its foes.

Such are the plain facts : easily verified, easily understood. But at the time, as has been pointed out, nobody seemed to study the measure itself ; every one viewed it through some distorting lens. Had the circumstances in which the Act was passed been different, it might have

¹ Two at least of the Ritual prosecutions of the last few years were set on foot under the provisions of the Act of 1840, because the complainant, being a non-parishioner, would have been unable to prosecute under the Public Worship Regulation Act.

come into operation, not certainly without criticism and objection, but without a tenth of the exasperation and strife with which its very name has come to be associated. The *fons et origo mali* lay far less in the provisions of the Act than in the occasion and manner of its birth. In other words, it was not the measure itself which pinched, but the resolution to have a measure, and to have it without delay. The foregoing narrative, compiled in part from public sources and in part from the Archbishop's correspondence at the time, will show some of the difficulties among which he had to steer. Wisdom after the event is easy, and, were the exact occasion to recur, there are many particulars in which a different course would probably be adopted from that taken in 1874. But the objections which in recent years have proved most forcible on platforms and elsewhere were neither raised by the opponents of the Bill nor anticipated by its friends while the legislation was in actual progress. Foremost among these has been the difficulty felt about the jurisdiction and spiritual authority of the judge appointed by the two Archbishops to preside in the Provincial Courts. Whatever the value of this objection, it was certainly not made prominent while the Bill was under debate. Lord Salisbury, for example, in opposition to Archbishop Tait, thought the judge should be appointed directly by the Crown, rather than by the Archbishops, and Lord Bath, Lord Devon, and other High Churchmen, supported Lord Shaftesbury's amendments in preference to the Episcopal Courts and assessors of the original Bill. Again, the alleged manufacture of 'aggrieved parishioners,' which has caused so much soreness in the last few years, seems to have occurred as a possibility neither to friend nor foe, while the interminable delays and costs of recent suits, to what-

ever cause they may be due, were far from being anticipated by the Archbishop's opponents, who feared, on the contrary, that the facility and cheapness of future proceedings would be an encouragement to vexatious litigation.

One charge, however, has been reiterated from the very first. It is said that in his supposed scorn for Convocation the Archbishop deliberately declined, when introducing Parliamentary legislation upon so 'spiritual' a matter as the Church's internal discipline, to take counsel with the sacred Synod of his province. The actual facts seem to be as follows. When the legislative plan was first propounded, the Bishops unanimously resolved that the measure should be communicated to Convocation concurrently with its introduction in Parliament. But the unexpected dissolution of Parliament, and consequently of Convocation, and the subsequent occurrence of Lent¹ before a new Session could be held, rendered it impossible to fulfil this plan if the measure was to have a chance of becoming law within the year. So soon as Convocation could meet, the Archbishop made an announcement to the Lower House upon the subject, and invited the opinion of its members upon a series of points connected with the Report they had drawn up a few years before. But he carefully avoided any statement which should seem to recognise an inherent right in Convocation to veto or delay Parliamentary action upon a subject of this kind, connected with legal procedure and not with doctrine, a subject too on which Convocation had already reported, and had even invited Parliamentary legislation. Rightly or wrongly, he was of opinion that Convocation possessed no such privilege

¹ By a tacit understanding, Convocation is never summoned for business in Lent, when many of the parochial members would be unable to attend.

of concurrent action,¹ and although anxious, as a matter of courtesy, to give the assembled clergy the fullest information as to the intention of the Bishops in Parliament, he would have shrunk from any promise to go further. He had full experience of the weary length to which Convocation could prolong the discussion of such a subject, and he was strongly urged by more than one of his brethren, the soundness of whose Churchmanship was beyond dispute, that to expect the actual co-operation of the 'sacred Synod' in the details of Parliamentary action was to endanger hopelessly the success of any plan whatever. The Bishop of Winchester, for example, who had been in conference with other bishops on the subject, wrote as follows:—

“We thought that it might be well if Convocation could concur with Parliament in the matter, but some of us, who had had experience of the Lower House, thought it would be an endless affair if it were altogether submitted to that House. As a *tertium quid* it was suggested that perhaps the Archbishop might think it well to announce his intentions in the Upper House, so that the clergy might not complain that they were taken at unawares, but that it would hardly do to send it down to the Lower House.”

What the Archbishop dreaded most throughout the controversy was the success which might attend “the tactics of delay.” He saw—perhaps he even over-estimated—the harm caused by the noisy and acrimonious discussion of such a subject, and he feared, beyond all else, the prolongation of those discussions for another year while nothing practical was being done. With the advance of the Session this fear naturally increased, and almost anything seemed preferable to the postponement

¹ Lord Salisbury, a fair representative of moderate High Churchmen, supported this view with much emphasis in the House of Lords.—*Hansard*, June 4, 1874, p. 948.

of the measure while the tide of controversy ran so high. The Bishops had definitely agreed upon their plan. It was his aim to adhere as nearly as possible to its original shape, but at least to secure that, provided its essential features and safeguards were preserved, it should, in some shape or other, become law. Most of the Bishops shared this view as to the dangers of delay. The Bishop of Peterborough, for example, in withdrawing the amendment he had proposed, freely admitted that—

“The question of time had its influence with him. At first he was in favour of postponing legislation on the whole matter, but the passion and panic existing at this moment had entirely changed his opinion on that point. From what he saw of the tempers that had already been elicited by that Bill, he confessed he did not think it would be safe or wise to wait for a year longer, and run the further risk of violent meetings and counter-meetings. . . . Whoever would take such a responsibility, he, for one, dared not.”¹

It is this fear of the mischief arising from delay which explains the Archbishop's firm and even stern resistance to the request for more time for discussion in Convocation and elsewhere. The discussions, he thought, had been already more than ample. It was full time that action should follow. Convocation, as might have been expected, took a different view, and the complaints of undue haste were loud and deep. Irritated, perhaps not unnaturally, by what they regarded as an infringement of their rightful privileges,² the Lower House, while fully admitting the need of legislation, declined to recommend the manner of it proposed in the Archbishops' Bill. In vain the Bishop of Winchester and others tried to allay the irritation by

¹ *Hansard*, June 15, p. 1572. See also the Archbishop's own words on the subject, June 4, p. 946.

² See the *gravamen* sent to the Upper House, and discussion thereupon. *Chronicle of Convocation*, May 1, 1874, p. 202.

explaining the readiness of the Bishops to listen to any practical suggestion not contrariant to the essence of their Bill.¹ The Lower House was not to be appeased, and the measure and its authors were denounced with increasing vehemence as the week's debates went on. It was described as "mulcting an incumbent of the proceeds of his living till he has yielded to the personal fancy of his Bishop," and as "introducing seven-and-twenty Star Chambers into the Church of England." If the Archbishop's speech in the House of Lords had contributed to fan the flame rather than to quench it, the Convocation debates were not calculated to give him an example of a quieter mode of conducting controversy. And when the arena of discussion was removed from the Convocation Chamber to St. James's Hall, the denunciatory and even threatening speeches waxed warmer still. By the time that Convocation met for its second session early in July, the Bill in its altered shape had left the House of Lords, and was to enter in a few days upon the House of Commons. It had by that time become so usual to assert, as a matter of fact, that the Bishops generally had disapproved of the Archbishop's action in introducing such a Bill, that the Archbishop took occasion to call emphatic attention once again to the practical concurrence of the whole Episcopate in the action he had taken.

"Your Lordships are aware," he said,² "that such steps as have been taken by yourselves, and by myself and the Archbishop of York, could not have been taken except with a tolerably general consensus that the time had come when some such steps must be taken, and I think it is only due to the

¹ See *Chronicle of Convocation*, May 1, 1874, p. 204. The Lower Houses of both Convocations appointed Committees which made suggestions for the amendment of the Bill, as it stood in the month of May. Of the twenty-six suggestions made by the Canterbury Committee, sixteen were adopted by the Archbishop, one at least of these being of great importance.

² *Chronicle of Convocation*, July 9, 1874, p. 395, etc.

Bishop of Lincoln and to myself to state that I was greatly influenced in bringing forward the measure, which has attracted so much attention, by the fact that a man of the Bishop of Lincoln's position and character had urged us as strongly as any of my right reverend brethren that we should take up this matter and introduce some legislation, with the view of bringing the Church into a better state of order in respect to these things. It is therefore with great sorrow that I have seen in various publications the declaration that 'faithful among the faithless found' has been the Bishop of Lincoln, and that he alone has from the first steadily resisted the plan for this legislation,¹ whereas, as a matter of fact, I have felt myself greatly influenced in moving for legislation by the advice and counsel which I have received from him. I have no doubt that this is one of those misunderstandings which continually arise when people take upon themselves, *ab extra*, to judge, where they have not a knowledge of what goes on within the *penetralia* of discussion in bodies intrusted with great responsibilities. The Bishop of Lincoln will correct me if I say anything that is wrong, but I believe that he has been as anxious as any of ourselves to restrain those extravagant practices; that he has thought with all of us throughout that some legislation in the matter was imperatively called for, and that the only point of difference which has existed between us, if difference it can be called, has been that he felt more strongly than some of us that it was desirable that, *pari passu* with the discussion of these matters in Parliament, there should also be a discussion of them in Convocation. . . ."

In his reply to this speech the Bishop of Lincoln spoke as follows:—

"Your Grace's remarks are only another indication of that feeling of generosity and courtesy which you always extend to your suffragan Bishops, and I feel bound a second time publicly

¹ This refers specially to a speech made by Canon Liddon at a great meeting in St. James's Hall a few weeks before, in which, after animadverting with the utmost severity upon the conduct of the Bishops, he had continued, "Sir, let us be just. Let us do honour to the noble Bishop of Lincoln—the one man who felt the heart of an apostle beating within him," etc. (*Authorised Report of the Meeting*, p. 23.)

to state how deeply I am indebted to your Grace for that unreserved expression of those feelings and opinions which distinguish your Grace as one of the brightest examples of the toleration of the Church of England. . . . As to the introduction of the Public Worship Regulation Bill, . . . I fully concur in and corroborate your Grace's statement that with your other suffragans I was very desirous that something should be done in order to check lawlessness and extravagance in Ritual on the one side, and negligence in the performance of the offices of the Church upon the other. Your Grace has stated what was perfectly true, that that was my mind, as it is my mind now. But with regard to the manner of the introduction of that measure, I must take leave to observe that I conceive that the way in which it was first promulgated was sure to produce discontent and heartburning among the clergy, and to frustrate the measure itself. . . . My objection was not so much to the attempt as to the manner of its introduction."

These speeches bear out what has been already said as to the real grounds of objection to the Bill. It may fairly be maintained that Archbishop Tait never fully realised their weight, or, at least, that he failed to appreciate the importance attached to them by many for whose opinion he honestly cared. It had always been his characteristic, as every reader of this book must be aware, to fix his attention on the practical end in view, and to make comparatively light of what seemed to him the petty scruples of those who cared more than he did about the precise details of the path. Particulars of system or procedure which had, in the view of some, attained all the dignity of fundamental principles appeared to him neither interesting nor important. On some occasions in his life this fixedness of aim and disregard of difficulties, real or imaginary, had stood him in good stead, and had resulted in complete success. But it was not always so. Riding thus rough-shod over the obstacles in his way, he unintentionally gave more pain than he was at all aware of, both to his opponents and his friends.

And in his present effort it was, above all, desirable that he should conciliate the good men from whom on principle he was forced to differ, so as to enlist upon the side of peace and order those whose real aim, from whatever standpoint, coincided with his own. It cannot be pretended that in this he was successful in the legislation of 1874. But it is equally true that he desired to ascertain the wishes of all parties, and that in his action from first to last, there was a total absence of anything like a persecuting spirit. He had certainly no personal sympathy with the care for Ritual details ; and the time spent in their elaboration, beyond what reverence required, was often, as he thought, time wasted, time stolen from weightier things. More harmful still, in his view, were the ceaseless controversies about these matters of detail, and what he most desired was, as he expressed it, "to get these disputes quickly and quietly settled on one side or the other, so as to set men free for the greater conflicts and duties which pastoral work involves." He had an impatient contempt for the recriminations of partisan strife, and he set himself, as he hoped and thought, to take away the occasion for them.

When Mr. Disraeli described the Act as passed "to put down Ritualism," he won from the House of Commons an inconsiderate cheer, but he showed how far he was from appreciating the hopes and aims of the Bishops in the introduction of such a Bill, and his ill-timed phrase did more, perhaps, than anything else to embarrass and hinder the peaceful solution to which the Archbishop had looked forward. There had been a practically universal consensus of opinion on the part of Churchmen that legislation of some sort was called for ; it had been introduced, and shaped, and modified, amid a hundred unexpected obstacles, in what seemed, from week to week, to be the

best attainable form. Once carried, its possibilities for good depended, as the Archbishop incessantly urged in after years, upon how it was practically administered. The history of his own diocese during his last ten years is an evidence, were evidence required, that there was nothing incompatible between advocating the passage of the notorious Act and a wide and generous sympathy with every form of earnest life within the Church. He had contended firmly for the Bishop's right of absolute veto upon every prosecution, and the possession of that power proved in his hands an effectual security for peace. The deplorable strifes which have taken place since 1874 are constantly spoken of as though they were due to this terrible Act of Parliament. Rather they are a fresh development of the spirit which made legislation first possible and then inevitable. As a matter of fact there have, during the sixteen years since the Act was passed, been only some seven or eight prosecutions in all under its provisions.¹ The clamour which these have caused has led many people to imagine that they have been at least ten times as numerous.

It is easy to characterise the Public Worship Regulation Act as having proved in practice to be a conspicuous failure from first to last. It is less easy to show that, if Archbishop Tait had left the growing strife alone, it would have been possible in the temper, then and since, of Parliamentary Protestantism, to have kept the Church in calmer waters, or to have avoided rocks and shoals even more dangerous than those among which he steered her course.

It has seemed better, in this chapter, to let the narrative of facts go forward without the interruption of extracts from the Archbishop's journal of the time. Its

¹ See *Report of Ecclesiastical Courts Commission*, 1883, p. 291, etc.

entries, in these months of somewhat stormy business, are unusually meagre, and add little to the record which has been already given. But a few extracts from its pages may be placed together not unfitly here :—

Diary.

“ADDINGTON, *Sunday, 17th Jany. 1874.*—Tuesday and Wednesday last were entirely occupied with a great meeting of Bishops at Lambeth to consider the present state of the Church. I was struck, on looking round the room, to see that of the twenty-four Bishops present, there were only two (Llandaff and Durham) who were not my juniors, and my experience of seventeen years, on which I dwelt at times, seemed strange to myself. . . . The results of our two meetings may be seen in the notes which I have preserved.”¹

“ADDINGTON, *Jany. 25.*— . . . Yesterday morning we were all astonished, and our plans for moving to London upset, by the dissolution of Parliament and Gladstone’s address to his constituents at Greenwich. His cry is the removal of the income tax and extension of county franchise. All other matters are left in the dim mist. To-day we have had the Holy Communion in the Chapel, as I was unwell and unable to go to the parish church. Have been reading a fair article on John Stuart Mill’s Life, in the *Quarterly*. Not an unfit subject for Sunday reading, as the problems his life raises go to the very root of our religious and social institutions.”

“LAMBETH, *Sexagesima, Feb. 8th.* . . . The fate of the Gladstone Ministry has been sealed by the elections, and the newspapers have taken much time each day. Yesterday we came up here, and I have preached in the parish church on the opening of the London Mission—‘*A sower went out to sow his seed.*’ Read Thorold’s most interesting paper on ‘Missions.’ Certainly it is a great work for Christ which is here undertaken at this time.”

“ADDINGTON, *Feb. 15th, Sunday.*—On Friday, after a very busy day, full of important business, I was seized in the evening

¹ These notes are copious, but as the meetings of Bishops are strictly confidential, it would be wrong, as has been already said, to make any public use of the memoranda, at least until after the lapse of many years. See note in vol. i. p. 283.

with a shivering, feverish fit, which has kept me in bed ever since. Carpenter insists on my lying by for a week, and I am thankful to be at home and to have nothing to prevent my remaining here till the Ordination. Dear Craufurd's '*Si quis*' has been read in church here. I have been hearing Patteson's *Life* and *Lamartine's Life*. . . . The elections are almost over. It is clear the Conservatives will have a great majority."

"ADDINGTON, *March 1, 2d Sunday in Lent*.—I have been in bed ever since my last entry, all through Ash Wednesday and last Sunday, and know not when I shall leave it, though, thank God, I am doing very well. Alas! I have not been able to take my Ordination to-day. When my illness increased I was obliged first to settle that the candidates should be examined at Lambeth, and then that the Ordination should be held at St. Mark's, Kennington [instead of here]. . . . Our dear son was ordained deacon by the Bishop of Dover to-day. His sisters and mother were present. May God bless him in all his work! There were nineteen deacons and priests in all, Davidson being one. My correspondence-book shows I have not been idle, though in bed."

"*Sunday, 8th March*, ADDINGTON.—Thank God I have mended, and am now able to sit up and move from room to room. But my dear wife has been far from well. . . . O God, spare her valuable life for many years. . . . I have done my daily work of correspondence, but I have had to ask the Bishop of London to preside for me at the formal opening of Convocation in St. Paul's. I have done much business from my room, and have read much."

"*Sunday, March 15th*, ADDINGTON.—Another week. Still confined to the house. . . . Ridiculous report of my resignation in the *Record*. Contradicted next day. Much work, owing to article in *Times* and general correspondence on the Bishops' proposed Bill. Much reading. . . ."

"*Sunday, March 22*, ADDINGTON.—Thank God I am regaining my strength. I have been to church this morning for the first time for five weeks. . . . Many most important letters this week. I have been busy ever since I was taken ill with coming Church legislation.

"Dear Craufurd has gone to take up his abode at Saltwood

with all his books and other belongings. The Lord be with him in all his ways. . . . Thanks be to God.

"I have read the following books while I have been unwell : *Memoirs of Lamartine, and of his Mother*; *Bishop Patteson's Life*; *Lord Elgin's Life*, by T. Walrond; *Nancy*, by Miss Broughton; *Lancashire Sixty Years Ago*, by Sir J. K. Shuttleworth; Miss Yonge's *Chaplet of Pearls*; Sir Walter Scott's *Napoleon*, vol. i., and part of vol. ii.; *Constable's Life*; *Protoplasm*, by Dr. Beale; Articles in *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly* on John Stuart Mill; and others.

"My letters to the Queen, Disraeli, the Dean of Windsor, Lord Salisbury, Lord Shaftesbury, the Archbishop of York, etc. etc., respecting coming Church legislation, have taken much time and more thought."

"*Palm Sunday, March 29.*—On Thursday I spent a busy day in London, the first for a long time; interviews with Disraeli, the Chancellor, and many of the Bishops. . . .

"On Wednesday (25th) was the anniversary of our beloved Catty leaving us, and we had the Holy Communion in our chapel. Eighteen years she has been in Paradise. . . ."

"*Sunday, April 19th, LAMBETH.*—On Friday we had a meeting of Bishops for six hours about our Bill. On Saturday received a deputation from Manchester about closing public-houses on Sundays. Then went to Disraeli, with Archbishop of York, about our Bill. Very busy at home all these days. Have been able to ride again."

"*Sunday, April 26th, LAMBETH.*—A busy and anxious week. Spoke on first reading of my Bill on Monday; the House full and attentive, and, on the whole, favourable. Each day since has brought heavy work. . . . The business of our projected legislation is very difficult and very engrossing. The newspapers are disposed to fulminate against it, especially, of course, the virulent Ultra-High Church organs. May all be guided aright for the good of the Church.

"Read to-day Craufurd's first two sermons in MS. Very well written: pointed and good. . . .

"Have only had time this week to read the article in *Quarterly* on Samuel Wilberforce, by Ashwell. Too clerical a view of him, but bringing out markedly his great powers of work and organi-

sation. Have been reading also Sir B. Frere on East African slavery."

"*Sunday, May 3d.*—Discussions this week in the House of Lords about the postponement of my Bill. Agreed to let the second reading stand over till Monday, 11th. Convocation sitting all the week : its debates full of importance. . . . Craufurd writes from Saltwood—'An ecclesiastical hurricane is raging round my father.' But here, in the centre of it, I feel particularly quiet. I take care, however, to read all the abuse in the newspapers, that I may be prepared for emergencies. . . . I trust that all may be rightly directed as regards the coming Bill. Our great Convocation gathering was on Wednesday."

"*Sunday, May 10th, LAMBETH.*—Again I am in bed for the day, having been so giddy when I got up that Haden declared it impossible for me to preach, as I had promised. The Bishop of Gloucester most kindly supplied my place at a minute's notice. . . . The week has passed busily—Convocation and correspondence : consultation about the Bill. . . . On Tuesday I spoke for the Church Missionary Society. . . . On Wednesday a Confirmation in Lambeth Chapel. . . . On Friday, after waiting three hours in the House, Lord Nelson and I had a sharp passage—see Report. . . . To-morrow is appointed for the Bishops' Bill in the House of Lords. O Lord, direct all for the best interests of Thy Church."

"*Sunday after Ascension Day, May 17, LAMBETH.*—Thank God, I have got pretty well through this week. It was no joke, ill and giddy as I was on Monday, to get ready for the debate on my Bill in House of Lords. We dined at four, and remained in the House, incessantly occupied, from five to twelve. I spoke about half-past eleven, and got to bed towards one, very thankful to have it over. On Tuesday I was done up, but managed to attend the Wilberforce memorial meeting, and the Church of England Temperance meeting at Lambeth. . . . On Friday at home all day, to get rid of my illness and clear off arrears of business. Have read Froude's Ireland, and 'Unorthodox London.' . . . Immense reception here yesterday from four to seven. To-day consecration of Bishop of Cape Town. Thank God, we have brought this at last to a conclusion. . . . Much anxiety about my Bill, but we keep very quiet in the middle of the storm."

"*Whitsunday, May 24, STONEHOUSE.*—Thank God, we are here quietly to recruit after the fatigues of the last six weeks. Last week was full of bustle. On Monday, after seeing Brunel and others on business, I had to start for Buckingham Palace to have an interview with the Czar of Russia. He was kind and courteous, but we entered on no subject of importance. . . . Thence, at half-past twelve, to his reception at the Guildhall.

. . . The scene was magnificent and the arrangements perfect, but the Czar nearly stuck in his English speech, either from the loss of his spectacles or from his secretary having written it badly. . . . Back to Lambeth in time for Diocesan Church Building Society meeting. I had the Bishops' Ascensiontide dinner in the evening. On Tuesday (19th) two hours' deputation from the English Church Union, by appointment, on the subject of my Bill. No very satisfactory result, except probably a better understanding on all sides. Three to four, Irish Church meeting and speech in Lambeth library. Five to seven, discussion with Archbishop of York and Lord Selborne in House of Lords. Bishop of Melbourne and others to dinner at Lambeth. *Wednesday.*—Much business. Then festival of Sons of the Clergy. Lord Mayor, dinner and speeches. Foreign Office at ten to meet the Czar. . . . Now here to rest and write."

"*Sunday, June 7th, LAMBETH.*— . . . The business of the Bill has been very perplexing this week. Government made an alliance with Lord Shaftesbury which has necessitated a change of many clauses. I learned from the Chancellor that it was he who drew up the clauses and put them in Shaftesbury's hands."

"*Sunday, June 14, LAMBETH.*—On Monday and Tuesday the Bill again in the House of Lords till a very late hour. Spoke on Tuesday at 'Bishop of London's Fund' meeting. On Wednesday Diocesan Conference in the library at Lambeth. • Queen's concert at night. . . . On Thursday dined with the Lord Chancellor. Great excitement about the Bill, the Bishop of Peterborough being with us. Yesterday went to Addington for a rest; drove about woods. To-day preached (Hospital Sunday) at Christ Church, Lancaster Gate. It is a great cause of thankfulness that I have kept so well this busy week. The excitement about the Bill has been immense. O Lord, overrule all to the good of Thy Church."

"*Sunday, June 21, LAMBETH.*—On Monday last, Bishop of

Maine and others to breakfast. Bill still in Committee in evening. *Tuesday*.—Much business; dined with Lord Halifax. *Wednesday*.—Heavy business. Wilberforce memorial meeting. Spoke. Dinner at Mansion House. Spoke twice. *Thursday*.—Wellington College Speech-day; spoke. Read Shakespeare in the evening with the children. *Friday*.—Busy all day on the Bill. Debate in Lords till eleven o'clock, speaking often. *Saturday, 20th*. Business at home. Then Sons of Clergy meeting. Then British Museum meeting for two hours. Read novel. Dined with the Bishops at Fulham. Many changes! Have read Archdeacon Sinclair's 'Charge,' and a good deal of Brewster's Life."

"*Sunday, July 5th, ADDINGTON*.—We are here for a Sunday's rest after a very busy week. We have been to the quiet parish church in the morning, and to Shirley in the afternoon, driving through the woods with Tommy.¹ Attended the funeral of old Gunner, and saw him laid close to his old master, Archbishop Sumner, in the beautiful churchyard. It was a strange contrast to the work of the day before, when we had received the Prince and Princess of Wales, Prince Christian, Princess Louise, Duke of Cambridge, and some six hundred other guests, in the house and gardens at Lambeth. . . . Last Monday we came to town early, in time for me to go to Windsor with the Convocation Address to the Queen. A fair gathering of members of Convocation. I had a private interview with Her Majesty afterwards on the subject of the Bill. How full of interest is this busy life, and how good to have quiet pauses in it to remind us that it is passing."

"*Sunday, July 12th, LAMBETH*.—The rush of life this week has been tremendous. Charterhouse School meeting on Monday. Then House of Lords. *Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday*.—Convocation, with 'Letters of Business' on Ritual Reports. Endless work. . . . *Wednesday*.—A public meeting for Colonial Bishopricks Fund. *Thursday*.—After Convocation, baptism of the little Teck at Kensington Palace. . . . Then Gladstone's great speech against my Bill in the Commons. I heard it from the Ladies' Gallery. Great excitement in the House."

"*Sunday, July 19th, LAMBETH*. . . .—This week the tide of public opinion on the subject of my Bill has risen, and, to the

¹ A favourite old pony.

astonishment of beholders, instead of Gladstone's resolutions carrying the day, they have only provoked feeling against him. Disraeli has thrown himself in for the Bill, which on Wednesday passed the second reading without a division. In fact, the opposition has collapsed. I attended the House of Commons for some time on Wednesday. . . . Next day Gladstone withdrew his resolutions, and on Friday the Bill made great progress in committee. Lord Houghton met me on the steps of the Athenæum,—‘You are as triumphant as Laud in his worst times: I hope it is not to end in the same way.’ . . . Truly the events of the last week give cause for thankfulness to Almighty God. I trust the excitement will now die, and the Church return from agitation to its legitimate work of winning souls. . . . We are approaching the end of a busy and anxious session. May God grant His blessing on its work.”

“*Sunday, August 9th, ADDINGTON.*— . . . On Monday night, as I was returning from town, I was pursued by a messenger from Disraeli to say, that unless we could carry the Commons’ amendment the Bill was lost.¹ . . . On Tuesday the Bishops met by appointment at the House of Lords. They were bent on resistance to the clause, and carried the day. All voted against it except Carlisle, who did not vote, the Chancellor’s attempt at a compromise having broken down. All seemed very black, and I went home and to bed, convinced that we had lost our six months’ labour, and must prepare for a frightful year of agitation. It was not till I had read the *Times* Article next morning that I had any hope, and, immediately after I had read it, came a second note from Disraeli to say that, in his judgment, all was lost.² I had my carriage at the door, and having a note from the Duke of Richmond saying that almost everything depended on the line taken by Sir William Harcourt (who was supposed to be the leader of the irreconcilables), I started in pursuit of him to his house: found him gone: tracked him to his club: got him into my carriage and urged wiser counsels. . . . I used my best influence too with Holt and others, not to divide against the Lords’ resolution. It was an unspeakable relief to find that a night’s sleep had brought — and

¹ See letter quoted above, page 215.

² The note is as follows:—“I am employed in trying to rally the ship. I conclude the Bill is lost. This is a heavy blow, I would almost say a fatal one.—D.”

—— to this mind. . . . I and the Archbishop of York had a long talk with Disraeli. Then, at twelve, began that memorable debate, which I cannot describe, but which will be found in Hansard. By two o'clock the Bill was safe, and I wrote in the House of Lords to the Queen—'Thank God, the Bill has passed.' I received congratulations on all sides. So ends a work which has given no rest for six months. May God grant that the peace and lasting good of His Church may follow from our labours!"

CHAPTER XXV.

RITUAL DISPUTES.

FOLKESTONE—HATCHAM—WOLVERHAMPTON—BORDESLEY.

1875-1879.

THE operation and results of the Public Worship Regulation Act belong less to the Biography of Archbishop Tait than to the general history of our time. But the Archbishop maintained so stoutly during the legislative struggles of 1874 that everything must, after all, depend upon the manner in which the Act was used or misused by the Bishops, that it is essential to recount in some detail what was his own procedure in the few Ritual cases which came officially before him under that enactment. It was in his own diocese that the first of these arose.

In the year 1872, two years before the passing of the Public Worship Act, complaint was made to the Archbishop with reference to certain 'Stations of the Cross' and other devotional ornaments in the Church of St. Peter's, Folkestone, of which the Rev. C. J. Ridsdale was incumbent. After inquiry, the Archbishop, in March 1873, issued a monition from his Diocesan Court directing the removal of the 'ornaments' in question. The Churchwardens resisted the monition on the technical ground that in the formal papers the Archbishop's secretary, Mr. J. B. Lee, acting, as is usual, in an official character, was merely described as "of 2 Broad Sanctuary, Westminster," and that such designation failed to set forth "an interest in the matter complained of."

In the Diocesan Court the objection was considered inadequate, but on appeal this judgment was reversed and the Archbishop was condemned in costs. Immediately on the Public Worship Act coming into operation, the complaint was renewed, and a large number of new accusations added, with reference to ritual acts in the conduct of Divine service.

By one of those fatalities which seem to attach to ecclesiastical suits, the formal complaint arrived while the Archbishop was in Switzerland, and Mr. Ridsdale was also away from home; and the Archbishop, after in vain telegraphing to the lawyers in the endeavour to postpone proceedings beyond the legal 'twenty-one days,' found himself compelled to write to Mr. Ridsdale instead of securing a personal interview with him. The following letters explain his attitude:—

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to Mr. J. B. Lee
(his legal Secretary).*

“SWITZERLAND, 23^d Aug. 1875.

“ . . . I suppose [from what you say] the Ridsdale affair cannot now be stayed till my return. My usual mode of proceeding, as I had arranged it in my own mind for any such case, was intended to be this. On hearing that complaint was made in any case, I intended to write to, and to see, the clergyman complained of, and judge, after such communication with him, whether I should or should not allow proceedings to go on. The unfortunate circumstance of the complaint being made while I am in Switzerland makes this impossible in this instance. But indeed, in Mr. Ridsdale's case there is, I fear, nothing new to urge. . . . I send, however, a private letter, which—if you see no objection—I should wish to have sent to Mr. Ridsdale at once. But no delay must be allowed which would endanger the lapse of the twenty-one days. As this is the first case under the Act, the greatest care must of course be taken.”

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. C. J. Ridsdale.

*" Travelling in Switzerland,
23d August 1875.*

"MY DEAR SIR,—I am informed that a formal representation has been, under the Public Worship Regulation Act, sent to my Diocesan Registry, complaining of various matters in St. Peter's Church, Folkestone. It will be my duty shortly to direct a copy to be sent to you, and you will then be called to say whether you are ready to submit to my directions in the matters complained of.

"I have understood from your former letters on other occasions that you desire (as indeed is I think your duty, in consideration of the obligation of your engagements of canonical obedience) to be guided by the admonitions of your bishop. I now write to point out to you that the proper and easy and most effectual mode of your making known your wish to be so guided will be, when you receive from my Registrar a copy of the complaint which has been lodged with him, to answer in such manner as will show that this is your desire, and in the event of the other party agreeing, the questions at issue will be left to be decided by me.

"With an earnest prayer that you may act rightly in this matter, I am, yours sincerely,
A. C. CANTUAR."

Immediately on his return to England the Archbishop had an interview with Mr. Ridsdale, but without effect. "It is heartbreaking," he wrote, "to find how one's hopes are thwarted by these good and earnest men. What they have come to understand by 'the law of the Church' I cannot even conjecture. I have done my best. May God direct all!" The case went forward, and was fully argued before Lord Penzance, sitting for the first time as Dean of Arches, in January 1876. Mr. Ridsdale appeared by counsel, "not," he said, "as recognising any spiritual character in the Court, but only a civil jurisdiction, capable indeed of commanding compliance under pains and penalties, but not of interpreting the law of the

Church so as to bind the consciences of Churchmen." "With these limitations," his letter added, "I feel happy in having the opportunity of defending my manner of public worship before Lord Penzance or any other tribunal of the country."

In an elaborate judgment, delivered February 3, 1876, the judge decided against Mr. Ridsdale upon all the twelve points complained of. Mr. Ridsdale appealed to the Privy Council against four of these decisions: those, namely, which forbade the 'Eastward Position,' the wearing of vestments, the use of wafer-bread, and the erection of a crucifix upon a rood screen. Once more there were long and learned arguments by counsel on both sides, and on May 12, 1877, a judgment, occupying two hours and a half in delivery, was read by the Lord Chancellor. The Court¹ pronounced against the legality of the vestments and the crucifix, but considered the Eastward position not illegal, provided due care be taken that the 'manual acts' are so performed as not to be invisible to the congregation. They decided that the charge of using wafer-bread of an illegal kind had not as a matter of fact been proved. It would be outside the purpose of this chapter to comment upon the particular decisions to which the judges came. The facts will be referred to on a later page.² Nor have they yet ceased to afford matter of keenest controversy. The Archbishop, as before, made no secret of his opinion that it mattered far less what should be the particular decision arrived at with reference to the vestures and ornaments

¹ The lay members of the Judicial Committee who heard the appeal were Lord Chancellor Cairns, Lord Selborne, Sir James W. Colville, the Lord Chief Baron, Sir R. Phillimore, Lord-Justice James, Sir M. Smith, Sir R. P. Collier, Sir B. Brett, and Sir R. Amphlett. The Episcopal Assessors were the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Chichester, the Bishop of St. Asaph, the Bishop of Ely, and the Bishop of St. David's.

² See p. 292.

in use, than that some authoritative judgment should be pronounced, which might set the long-lived controversy at rest.

On Trinity Sunday, a fortnight after the delivery of the judgment, Mr. Ridsdale, in an address to his congregation, announced his intention of disregarding the monition given him, in so far as it contradicted what appeared to him to be the clear directions of the Book of Common Prayer. His address concluded as follows :—

“ It is my devotion to the Church, our mother Church, and in particular to this provincial Church of Canterbury, which has made me do what I have done to-day rather than suffer the mighty power of the State to make me trample on the sacred laws of the Church. Your real welfare and my own would not be served by our doing violence to the authority of our own mother. I know I undertake this bitter work for a mother who is silent while her loyal sons are suffering in defence of her independence and dignity, when a clear sound issuing from her sacred synod might put a stop to our sufferings. For were that true authority in the things of God to make any order whatsoever concerning the manner of our worship, we should hasten to obey, whether we liked the order or no. But we must not complain. It is doubtless the wisdom of God that demands our obedience to a silent mother, who points still to her written orders, and seems to say, ‘Till I alter them, these are your directions to follow; they need no explaining nor reaffirming.’ Whether our Bishop will propose any relief, or will give any dispensation from the law of the Church which it would be right to accept, or otherwise meet our conscientious difficulty, remains to be seen. He holds an opinion with regard to these State Courts in which it is impossible for us to acquiesce, unless indeed in Ultramontane fashion we shut our eyes and blindly confess the infallibility of the See of Canterbury. As the Archbishop is the last person to desire that, we may hope he will in some manner open a way of relief to those who, on the subject of these Courts, respectfully refuse to subscribe to his opinion. At any rate, in doing what is very bitter, because we are persuaded it is right, we may commit ourselves and our cause to God in confidence of His mercy.”

The following correspondence thereupon ensued :—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. C. J. Ridsdale.

“ 11 GREAT STUART STREET, EDINBURGH,
30th May 1877.

“ MY DEAR MR. RIDSDALE,— I have been called away by the death of my brother. On my journey to this place I read in the *Standard* newspaper the report of an address which you are stated to have delivered on Sunday evening, the 27th inst., at Folkestone.

“ I gather from the conclusion of that report that you look to me as your Diocesan to help you in the difficulty in which you find yourself placed. I endeavour, therefore, to view the position you have assumed as you view it. I understand you to believe that there is an obligation on your conscience to follow what you hold to be the literal meaning of the Ornaments Rubric, but that you do not deny that this supposed obligation might be removed by an act of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury with the proper consent. I gather also from words attributed to you, that while Convocation does not speak (and indeed, by its silence in its corporate capacity as consisting of two Houses, rather seems to imply that there is no necessity for speaking, and that the rubrics must be interpreted by such aids as the living executive authorities of the Church can give),—I gather, I say, from some of the words attributed to you, that you are willing to be guided by me as your Bishop. Making full allowance, therefore, for your scruples of conscience, I am quite willing to take upon myself the whole responsibility, as intrusted with the spiritual supervision of the diocese in which you serve. I am ready to use all the authority I possess as Diocesan and Archbishop to relieve you from any such supposed obligation, and I gladly take upon myself the whole responsibility of directing that you do not wear a chasuble and alb at the administration of the Holy Communion ; also that you abstain from using lighted candles at such celebration, except when they are required for purposes of light ; and also that you abstain from mixing water with the wine in the Holy Communion. I feel confident that, by paying a ready obedience to this my episcopal admonition, you will place yourself in a much more satisfactory position in the sight of the whole Church, that your

own people will appreciate your dutiful obedience, and that your labours amongst them will be much more likely to be blessed by Almighty God than you could hope they would be if you acted on your own judgment against the command of the Bishop set over you in the Lord.

"Believe me to be, my dear Mr. Ridsdale, with every wish for your highest welfare, yours faithfully,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

The Rev. C. J. Ridsdale to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"ST. PETER'S, FOLKESTONE,
June 6, 1877.

"MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I am heartily obliged by your letter and your kind endeavour to view my position as I view it, *i.e.* as being under a sacred obligation to act upon the literal meaning of the Ornaments Rubric (whatever the civil penalties of pursuing such a course might be) until a competent Church Authority either frees me from the obligation or interprets the Rubric in some other way.

"Pending, therefore, the action of Convocation in the matter of the Ornaments Rubric, I am perfectly willing, as indeed I am bound, to submit to your Grace's canonical judgment and direction; but, as I began and carried on the ritual observances of which you speak in your letter from no private fancy of my own, but from what I understood, and still understand, to be the law of the Church of England, I feel that I ought to have such canonical grounds for submission to your Grace's directions as shall liberate me from a sense of wrong-doing.

"Your Grace kindly offers what doubtless appears to yourself a sufficient authority for my acting in the manner you direct; but you will pardon my saying that your words seem to me not altogether free from ambiguity, and in such an important matter I feel there ought to be no opening for misapprehension.

"I acknowledge the general dispensing power of a Bishop in laws which have (like the Rubrics of the Prayer-Book) the authority of the Provincial Synod. If, therefore, your Grace will inform me that your letter of the 30th ult. was intended to dispense me from the obligation of the Ornaments Rubric, and so from the obligation to use alb and chasuble, lighted candles at Communion-time, and the mixed chalice—and further, that

in view of imminent complications which might endanger the peace of the Church, your Grace orders me to accept and use such dispensation, I will do so.

"Or, again, if it was not your Grace's intention by your letter to dispense me from my obligation to obey the Ornaments Rubric in its literal acceptation, but to 'take order' out of the plenitude of your episcopal discretion and authority 'for the resolution of all doubts and to appease all diversity concerning the manner how to understand' that Rubric, in this parish at least, then I think your Grace will readily admit that being thus spiritually directed according to the rule laid down in the Preface to the Prayer-Book 'concerning the service of the Church,' I am entitled to claim that no Royal advertisements, Parliamentary enactments, or even Canon of the Church, prior to the date of the present Prayer-Book, should be employed to overthrow the literal and admitted sense of the Rubric itself, for it is emphatically laid down in that place, that such order of the Bishop for appeasing diversity must not be 'contrary to anything contained in this Book.'

"If your Grace will take into consideration the fact that you have never, throughout these six years during which I have worn the vestments, given me the slightest intimation that you considered I was breaking the law of the Church, you will, I am sure, forgive me for asking you for some assurance that by your present direction, made under my peculiar circumstances, you are (not merely enforcing the late decision of the Privy Council, but) delivering your own episcopal judgment to the effect that the Ornaments Rubric does not prescribe the use of alb and chasuble, lighted candles at Holy Communion, and the mixed chalice, and that therefore my obligation to use these things has been only a supposed one.

"On receiving this assurance from your Grace I will accept your judgment and, on the principle of canonical obedience, submit my own; and, so doing, I shall obey your Grace as Christ's representative in the government of His flock, so that, were the Act under which I have been prosecuted to be repealed to-morrow, or the prosecutors to be pronounced incompetent on account of the venality of at least one of their number, it would not affect my submission to your Grace during your tenure of the See of Canterbury.

"However, since the proviso already quoted from the Preface

to the Prayer-Book plainly contemplates a corrective power as existing *somewhere* over any order made by the Bishop, and the Declaration prefixed to the 'Articles' shows that that power resides in the Convocation of the Province, therefore, whether your Grace will choose to use your power of *dispensation* or your power of *authoritative interpretation*,—in either case, while I submit in the meantime to your Grace, I claim the right, as you correctly gather from my published address, to refer myself ultimately to the Convocation of Canterbury whenever it shall see fit to take the whole matter of the Ornaments Rubric into consideration.

"As this is an affair of such wide interest to the whole Church in England, I feel bound to publish this letter, and I hope I have your kind leave to publish your Grace's along with it.—I have the honour to remain, your Grace's humble obedient servant,
C. J. RIDSDALE."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. C. J. Ridsdale.

"LAMBETH PALACE, June 7, 1877.

"MY DEAR MR. RIDSDALE,—I have received both your letters of the 3d and 6th inst. on my return from Scotland.

"From the second of these letters I gather that while you consider yourself as being under a sacred obligation to act upon what you conceive to be the literal meaning of the Ornaments Rubrics in the Prayer-Book, you yet acknowledge a general dispensing power in the matter to reside in me as your Bishop, and that you are ready under such dispensation to abstain from the use of the alb and chasuble and lighted candles at the time of the Holy Communion, and the mixed chalice. I am quite ready to satisfy your conscience, and do hereby grant you a complete dispensation from the obligation under which you believe yourself to lie.—Yours faithfully,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

The Rev. C. J. Ridsdale to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"ST. PETER'S, FOLKESTONE,
June 9, 1877.

"MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I am in the receipt of your letter of Thursday, in which you grant me a complete dispensation

from the obligation which the authority of the Church imposes on me in respect of the Ornaments Rubric as I understand it.

"Further, your Grace has in your former letter directed me not to use the alb and chasuble, lighted candles at Communion-time, and the mixed chalice; by this direction commanding me (as I presume) to make use of your dispensation. I must, therefore, accept the dispensation, subject to the understanding expressed in my letter of last Wednesday, adding that if it shall appear that the opportunity for Convocation to deliberate passes without the question being solved, I feel I shall not be justified in using the dispensation any longer. — I am, your humble obedient servant,

C. J. RIDSDALE."

A few days after this solution had been arrived at, the Archbishop became responsible for the temporary charge of the vacant diocese of Rochester, containing the parish of St. James', Hatcham, the Vicar of which was the Rev. Arthur Tooth. In pursuance of a suit instituted against him for illegal ritual, Mr. Tooth had, in 1876, been first admonished, and then inhibited by the Provincial Court. He defied the inhibition and resisted *vi et armis* the entrance of the clergyman appointed by the Bishop to officiate. In January 1877 a 'significavit' was issued for his committal to prison for contempt of Court, but after a short incarceration in Horsemonger Lane Gaol, he was released by order of the Court on the request of the complainants in the suit. On the 12th June the Archbishop became *de facto* Bishop of the diocese, pending the consecration of Mr. Thorold to the See. Without a day's delay he wrote to Mr. Tooth, inviting him to a private interview. On June 14 the Archbishop's Diary has the following entry:—

"I have had a long interview with Mr. Tooth, and have pressed on him the duty of conforming to the decisions of Convocation. I fear I shall not find him so amenable to authority as Mr. Ridsdale."

The sequel will be found in the following correspondence :—

The Rev. A. Tooth to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“THE VICARAGE, HATCHAM, *June 21.*

“MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I have considered your Grace’s communication to me at the interview I had the honour to have with you on the 13th inst. I have had search made in the ‘Chronicle of Convocation’ and in other books, and, so far, have not been able to discover that any canon, constitution, or ordinance provincial, or other synodical act, of such purport as your Grace was pleased to communicate to me, was made or enacted by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury on the 13th, 14th, and 16th days of February 1867—which were the days to which I understood your Grace to refer—or, indeed, at any time that I can discover. Neither can I discover that any such canon, constitution, or ordinance provincial, or other synodical act, has ever been promulged either by Convocation or by your Grace. I have therefore to request that your Grace will be good enough to enable me to find official and authoritative evidence of the making, enacting, and promulging of such canon, constitution, ordinance provincial, or other synodical act.—I remain, my Lord Archbishop, your Grace’s obedient servant,

“ARTHUR TOOTH.”

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. A. Tooth.

“LAMBETH PALACE, *June 22, 1877.*

“MY DEAR SIR,—I beg to acknowledge your letter of yesterday’s date. The record of proceedings in the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury to which I referred you at our interview of the 14th of June (not, I think, 13th) is to be found in the ‘Chronicle of Convocation’ for the year 1866-1867, pages 711 and 842.

“The resolution unanimously adopted by the Bishops in the Upper House on Wednesday, February 13th, 1867, concludes with the following words: ‘Our judgment is that no alterations from long-sanctioned and usual ritual ought to be made in our

Churches until the sanction of the Bishop of the diocese has been obtained thereto.'

"And in the Lower House on Friday, February 15th, 1867, it was resolved, by 47 votes against 3—'That this House concurs in the judgment of the Upper House, that no alteration from the long-sanctioned and usual ritual ought to be made in our Churches until the sanction of the Bishop of the diocese has been obtained thereto.'

"Let me recall to your memory what passed between us when I directed your attention to the decision of Convocation. Understanding that you demurred to the obligation of obedience to the Court of the Archbishop and the Supreme Court of Appeal, and gathering also from what had passed that you were not willing to be guided in the matter of ritual by the directions of the Bishop of your diocese, I asked to what authority you were prepared to bow, and having been led by your answer to believe that you consider such authority to reside in Convocation, I referred you to the decision of the two Houses of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, which I have quoted above. I added that I was informed that a similar decision had been arrived at by both Houses of the Convocation of the Province of York (March 20, 1867).

"In your letter of yesterday's date you write that you 'have not been able to discover that any canon, constitution, or ordinance provincial, or other synodical act of such purport,' was made or enacted 'on the days to which in our conversation I had referred, or indeed at any time.' Further, you state that you cannot 'discover that any such canon, constitution, or ordinance provincial, or other synodical act, has ever been promulged,' and you ask me for 'official and authoritative evidence of the making, enacting, and promulging of such canon, constitution, ordinance provincial, or other synodical act.'

"I do not know whether you intend to say that you object to the decision of Convocation to which I have referred you, because it has not received the sanction of the civil power.

"It is certain that in the Act of Submission of the Clergy (25 Henry VIII. cap. 19) it is enacted by the authority of Parliament that the clergy 'shall not enact, promulge, or execute any canons, constitutions, or ordinances provincial in their Convocations, unless they have the King's Royal Assent, and licence to make, promulge, and execute such canons, con-

stitutions, and ordinances provincial, or synodal.' Therefore, except in cases where the civil power steps in, no decision or judgment of Convocation can answer to such conditions as might be supposed from your letter to be deemed by you indispensable.

"As, however, I was led to understand from our conversation that this very intervention of the civil power caused the difficulty which weighs on your conscience, I am disposed to believe that what you ask for in your letter is not proof that the civil power was a consenting party to the decision or judgment in question, but rather a distinct reference, with dates and pages, to the record of that utterance which I understand, according to your principles, you regard as the living voice of the Church.—Believe me to remain, yours very truly,

A. C. CANTUAR."

The Rev. A. Tooth to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"THE VICARAGE, HATCHAM, NEW CROSS,
June 30, 1877.

"MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your Grace's letter of the 22d inst.

"I beg to thank your Grace for the reference to certain proceedings in the Upper and Lower Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury on the 13th and 15th of February 1867.

"Those proceedings, as I had supposed, and as your Grace points out, do not constitute a synodical act of the Province of Canterbury. I would however add, for fear of being misunderstood, that your Grace correctly interprets my judgment on this subject, by supposing that had the Synod of the Province passed, and your Grace promulged, or put in ure, any such synodical act, the fact of the State's refusal to recognise it as a canon would have made no difference in the respect with which I should have treated it.

"Your Grace will also permit me to observe that the resolutions to which you refer, taken in connection with the report of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation on the Ornaments Rubric in 1866, the preceding year, and with the subsequent action of the Lower House, involve the position that the Eucharistic vestments, which are some of the matters on which your Grace addressed me, are ordered to be retained and be in use in the Church of England.

"I would also remind your Grace, in reference to your allusion to the Court of the Archbishop, that the legality of the Eucharistic vestments was laid down by the judge of your Grace's Court when the matter became before him, and that any subsequent condemnation of them, either by the last judge of the Court of Arches or by the judge sitting under the Public Worship Regulation Act, has been passed in mere obedience to the rulings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.—I am, with much respect, your Grace's obedient servant,

"ARTHUR TOOTH."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. A. Tooth.

"LAMBETH PALACE, *Monday, July 2.*

"MY DEAR SIR,—Late on Saturday evening, the 30th June, I received your letter of that day, in answer to mine of the 22d.

"I had been led to hope that you were willing, in the matter of ritual, to conform your practice to what both the Upper and Lower Houses of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury formally denominate their 'judgment' passed on the 13th and 15th of February 1867, and never since reversed.

"I gather from the letter I have now received from you that while you do not doubt that this decision of Convocation forbidding alteration from the long-sanctioned and usual ritual of the Church of England without the consent of the Bishop of the diocese was formally adopted after mature deliberation, and published with the records of Convocation, you yet feel some conscientious objection to defer to this decision of both Houses of Convocation, unless it can be proved to you that it was in the technical sense of the word 'promulged or put in ure.' But thus to 'promulge or put in ure,' unless with the Royal licence, is, as I have already pointed out to you, the very thing prohibited under penalty by the Act of 25 Henry VIII. cap. 19. As it is by virtue of the series of Statutes, of which this is one, that you and I have for years claimed and exercised the rights and privileges which are peculiar to us as beneficed in the Established Church, I can hardly suppose that you think the Convocation of prelates and clergy ought to have 'promulged and put in ure' their decision without the State's authority, in direct contravention of the Statute. Yet it is difficult to understand your

present scruple without supposing one of two things—either that you desiderate the sanction of the civil power to give force to the decision of Convocation, or that you think we ought to have broken the law by promulging our judgment, and ‘putting it in ure’ without such sanction.

“I, of course, like most other people, hold that constitutionally the decisions of Convocation require the Royal assent and licence to give them binding force, but in my endeavour to put myself as fairly as possible in your position, and to give full weight to difficulties which had occurred to your mind, I brought before you this resolution of both Houses of Convocation, and I still hope that when you weigh the matter fully you will come to the conclusion that, according to your principles, it is an utterance to which you ought in consistency to bow.

“There cannot surely be any doubt as to the meaning of this resolution of both Houses.

“It is clear and explicit in forbidding any change from the usual ritual without the consent of the Bishop of the diocese. With reference, indeed, to what are called Eucharistic vestments, you correctly point out that the resolution in both Houses may fairly be taken in connection with the report of a Committee of the Lower House of Convocation, on the subject of Ritual, presented on the 26th June 1866. But you do not mention, nor can I find, anything in that report inconsistent with the plain meaning of the resolution adopted by both Houses. Neither, as I understand, do you allege that, by any subsequent act of the two Houses, the decision then arrived at has been set aside. If you know of any such subsequent resolution or resolutions of the two Houses, I shall be obliged if you will call my attention to them as soon as possible.

“In the close of your letter you refer, as I understand, to a judgment pronounced by Sir Robert Phillimore, late judge of the Arches Court, laying down, as you state, the legality of what are called the Eucharistic vestments. This judgment, as you correctly state, was reversed on appeal, and subsequent judgments have conformed to the decision of the Appeal Court. You seem to think that this judgment, which was afterwards thus reversed, has some ecclesiastical force peculiar to itself in the matter of vestments. You object to other subsequent judgments, because, as you say, they were passed in mere obedience to the rulings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It has, I

think, escaped your observation that the very judgment to which you seem to attach this peculiar binding force is itself distinctly based by Sir R. Phillimore on the construction which he supposed the words of the Statute had received in two previous judgments of the Privy Council (*vide* Sir R. Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law*, vol. i. p. 918, quoting his judgment in the *Purchas* case).

"To sum up what I have wished to bring before you, I consider that you are bound to express your readiness to abstain from the ritual observances which have caused so much contention in your parish:

"First, because of the obedience which you owe to the law of the Church of England, as interpreted by the Archbishop's Court and the Supreme Court of Appeal.

"Secondly, because you are formally called upon by me, as your Bishop, in virtue of your oath of canonical obedience, to conform to the order which, as acting Bishop of Rochester, I hereby lay upon you.

"Thirdly, because if through some scruple of conscience, to me inexplicable, you feel a difficulty in paying due obedience either to the law of this Church and Realm, as interpreted by the Courts, or to the Bishop set over you in the Lord, the decision of Convocation to which I have referred you seems to afford, on your principles, a solution of the difficulty in which you have involved yourself.

"I should be sorry to believe that you desire to act in contravention. alike of the law, the Bishop's order, and the express decision of the two Houses of Convocation.—I remain, yours very faithfully,

A. C. CANTUAR."

The Rev. A. Tooth to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"THE VICARAGE, HATCHAM, NEW CROSS,
July 7, 1877.

"MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—Your Grace has in some points misinterpreted my last letter.

"What I said, in substance, was that I could not gather that the informal resolutions to which your Grace referred me either constituted a canon, constitution, or ordinance provincial, or other synodical act, or had been promulged or put in ure as such. I did not suggest that such an ordinance provincial or synodical act should have been passed or promulged without the

Royal licence or sanction ; but I said that if it had been passed or promulged I should have obeyed it, whether it had or had not received such licence or sanction.

"Your Grace must excuse me for reminding you that the Statute prohibits equally passing without licence and promulging without sanction any ordinance provincial or synodical act. As therefore your Grace speaks of the Convocation—of which your Grace was a principal member—as bound in duty not to do what the Statute prohibits, it is clear that the resolutions to which you refer did not, in the judgment of Convocation, constitute an ordinance provincial or synodical act.

"I am, therefore, in this position : The Church of England, by the synodical acts of her Convocation in 1661, adopted a particular order of ritual, which I, at my ordination, pledged myself to obey, and your Grace does not show me, and I cannot discover, any ordinance provincial or synodical act repealing that order of ritual, or dispensing with obedience to it.—I am, my Lord Archbishop, your obedient servant,

"ARTHUR TOOTH."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. A. Tooth.

"LAMBETH PALACE, July 9, 1877.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have to-day received your letter dated the 7th of July. I have endeavoured in our correspondence to put before you on every ground the solemn obligation which rests upon you to a dutiful submission.

"If, against all the authorities I have advanced, you still assert your right to act in your public ministrations on your own private interpretation of the law of this Church and Realm, it is, I fear, needless for me to reason further with you. I can no longer hope that anything I can say will induce you to act as you ought.—I remain, yours very faithfully,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

The Archbishop's Chaplain to the Rev. A. Tooth.

"LAMBETH PALACE, July 9, 1877.

"REV. AND DEAR SIR,—I am desired by the Archbishop of Canterbury to forward to you the enclosed answer to your last letter, dated the 7th of July, and to inform you that his Grace

considers it due to the Church that the arguments he has used with you should be generally known. His Grace therefore proposes to make public his letters to you, and desires to know whether you are willing that your letters should be published at the same time. His Grace hopes to hear from you on this point before Friday next, the 13th of July.—I remain, rev. and dear sir, yours truly,

RANDALL T. DAVIDSON."

The Rev. A. Tooth to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"THE VICARAGE, HATCHAM, July 12, 1877.

"MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I have nothing to recall in the statements I have made in various letters which I have lately had the honour of addressing to your Grace. They involve the question of the constitutional order of this Church and Realm, and may prove of interest to the public. I wish my letters to be published together with those written by your Grace.

"Your Grace offers me what is not an Act of Convocation, what is not a canonical decision of a Bishop, what is not an Act of a Court received by this Church and Realm; and because, from the nature of my obligations, I am bound by a rule, and am unable to exercise a choice and accept one of your Grace's alternatives, you think well to reproach me and say I 'still assert my right to act in my public ministrations on my own private interpretation of the law of this Church and Realm.' I must say that I do not care to attempt to defend myself from a charge of wilfulness which cannot be maintained by any authority beyond your Grace's statement.—I am, my Lord Archbishop, your obedient servant,

ARTHUR TOOTH."

Upon the foregoing letters the *Guardian* commented as follows:—

"A correspondence, which we print elsewhere, of the Archbishop of Canterbury with the now famous Mr. Tooth, is like the play of a palace cat with a church mouse. The little creature dodges here and there, sometimes not without a species of success, in escaping the stroke of its big adversary, but more frequently the claw strikes home, and finally pins the poor animal to the floor. In the case of the mouse, our prevailing feeling is that of indignation at the cruelty of the persecutor, even though

the victim may have eaten our cheese. At the human antitypes it is lawful to be simply amused, for Mr. Tooth's skin is evidently of such substance that the point of the Archiepiscopal logic, whatever its force and value, is quite incapable of penetrating to his nerves of sensation."¹

Yet another case must be mentioned as one which excited great attention at the time, and brought upon the Archbishop, until the end of his life, a scarcely interrupted stream of hostile criticism. It shows the Archbishop's unreadiness to allow a prosecution if by any other means due and orderly regulations could be arrived at, whether or not these were in precise and technical accordance with the highest interpretations of Ritual Law.

In August 1876 complaints of ritual irregularity were brought against the Rev. Charles Bodington, Vicar of St. Andrew's, Wolverhampton, but at an early stage the proceedings were invalidated—*more ecclesiastico*—by some technical inaccuracies in the matter of dates. In the spring of 1877 fresh proceedings were commenced, the complainant in the case being the duly elected Churchwarden of the parish. Wolverhampton is in the diocese of Lichfield, but inasmuch as the Bishop is patron of St. Andrew's, it was legally necessary that the Archbishop should act in his place. The ensuing correspondence tells its own tale:—

The Rev. C. Bodington to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“S. ANDREW'S, WOLVERHAMPTON,
March 12th, 1877.

“MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—In August 1876 a representation under the Public Worship Regulation Act was made against me by three representatives of the Church Association. As soon as I knew of it I wrote to the Bishop of Lichfield, and asked for an interview, in order that I might state to him certain facts in

¹ *Guardian*, July 18, 1877.

connection with the case. The Bishop replied that he could neither see me nor my prosecutors while the case was *sub judice*. As soon as Lord Penzance gave his decision I wrote again to my Bishop, and renewed the request, which he granted at once, as there is at present no charge against me. The Bishop discussed with me the ritual now in use at my Church, point by point, and his Lordship, after considering the whole circumstances of the case, was satisfied, as your Grace will doubtless find, if you should communicate with him on the subject.

"As I have reason to believe that the Church Association is about to renew its attack on this parish, I feel it my duty to call your Grace's attention to the facts before the Public Worship Act is once more set in operation against us.—I remain, with the highest respect, my Lord Archbishop, your Grace's faithful servant,
CHARLES BODINGTON."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. C. Bodington.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
March 14th, 1877.

"REV. SIR,—I have received your letter of March 12th, and have at once written to the Bishop of Lichfield on the subject of it. I hope to receive an answer from the Bishop in a day or two, and shall be willing to see you at Lambeth, if convenient to yourself, on Wednesday, March 21st, at 12 noon.—Yours truly,
"A. C. CANTUAR."

The Rev. C. Bodington to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"ST. ANDREW'S, WOLVERHAMPTON,
March 15th, 1877.

"MY LORD: ARCHBISHOP,—It was at the suggestion of the Bishop of Lichfield that I wrote to inform your Grace of the position in which matters stand between his Lordship and myself with reference to the renewal of the attack upon my parish by the Church Association. I feel deeply the gravity of the situation; and with the desire of averting the scandal and misery which must ensue if the prosecution is renewed, I consulted my Bishop and stated the facts to him. He knows the wants of my parish and the circumstances of the case, and as he is in

correspondence with your Grace, it seems unnecessary for me to trouble your Grace by asking for an interview.—I have the honour to be, my Lord Archbishop, your Grace's obedient servant,

CHARLES BODINGTON."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. C. Bodington.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
March 16th, 1877.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I am not likely to see the Bishop of Lichfield, who I believe is engaged in his diocese, and I have not yet heard from him in answer to my letter written immediately on the receipt of your last. It is my impression that if I am called upon to act in the place of your Diocesan I shall find it very difficult to understand the circumstances of St. Andrew's parish, Wolverhampton, without a personal interview with you. In the event therefore of your having reason to suppose that any complaint will be made against you to me under the Public Worship Regulation Act, I should strongly advise you seeing me. I shall reserve the time mentioned in my last letter.—Yours very truly,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

Mr. Bodington, however, was ill, and unable to come, and as no formal representation had yet arrived, the matter stood over until the autumn, when it was thus resumed :—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. C. Bodington.

"STONEHOUSE, S. PETER'S, 3 Nov. 1877.

"MY DEAR SIR,—A complaint made by one of your Churchwardens respecting your mode of performing Divine service in the Church of S. Andrew, Wolverhampton, has been forwarded to me by your Diocesan, with the view that I should take cognisance of it as Archbishop of the Province. I shall feel much obliged if you will, if possible, meet me at Lambeth on Wednesday next, Nov. 8th, at 3 P.M., that I may have some conversation with you upon this subject.—Believe me to be, yours very truly,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

The interview took place, and Mr. Bodington promised to consider the suggestion made by the Archbishop, that he should formally express in writing his readiness to abide by the decision of his Diocesan upon the points in dispute. A short correspondence followed.

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. C. Bodington.

“STONEHOUSE, S. PETER’S, 11 Nov. 1877.

“MY DEAR MR. BODINGTON,—In reference to the complaints which have been made as to your mode of conducting Divine service, it is of great importance that I should know what is the exact position in which you stand, and how far, in your not unnatural desire to meet the wishes of a portion of your parishioners, you are still resolved loyally to conform to the direction of those set over you in the Lord. From the communications which you have made to me, I gather that you are ready, according to the direction contained in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, to resort to the Bishop of the diocese, and to conform your practice to his decision or direction, with regard to the manner in which you are hereafter to conduct Divine service.

“That there may be no misunderstanding, however, on this subject, it will be necessary that you should write to me explicitly, and, if possible, by return of post, stating that whereas doubts have arisen as to your mode of conducting Divine service in the Church of St. Andrew, Wolverhampton, you are ready, in the words of the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, to ‘resort to the Bishop of the diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this Book.’
—I remain, yours very truly, A. C. CANTUAR.”

The Rev. C. Bodington to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“S. ANDREW’S, WOLVERHAMPTON,
Novr. 13, 1877.

“MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—Your Grace’s letter did not reach me until after post-time this evening. I now hasten to reply,

and in compliance with your Grace's request I have written on another sheet my formal promise to abide by the Bishop of Lichfield's decision. . . .

(Enclosure.)

" 13 November 1877.

"MY LORD ARCHBISHOP,—Whereas doubts have arisen as to my mode of conducting Divine service in the Church of St. Andrew, Wolverhampton, and whereas your Grace has directed me, in the words of the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, to 'resort to the Bishop of the diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same be not contrary to anything contained in this Book,' I hereby declare that I did so resort to the Lord Bishop of Lichfield on Thursday last, the 8th November, and that I am ready to conform my practice loyally to his Lordship's decision and direction as contained in the letter which I received from him the following day, and forwarded to your Grace,¹ and that

¹ The Bishop of Lichfield's letter to Mr. Bodington was as follows :—

" THE PALACE, LICHFIELD, 8 Nov. 1877.

" MY DEAR MR. BODINGTON,—

" 1. My own desire is that in all the Churches in my Diocese, the Rubrics, as interpreted by the Court of Appeal, or as plain in themselves, should be strictly observed.

" 2. But I find that in many Churches the plea of custom is alleged to justify a deviation from the strict letter of the law; and these deviations are often cherished by the congregations almost as a right.

" 3. Where any such claim of custom is alleged I think that great caution should be used in enforcing prompt obedience upon an unwilling congregation by legal proceedings.

" 4. But I am clearly of opinion that even a minority of parishioners has a right to demand that the services of the Church should be performed for their benefit, in their own Parish Church, in a strictly legal manner, at certain convenient times, at which they may be able to attend, without seeing or hearing anything to offend their conscientious scruples; and at which they may be assured that no ordinance of the Church will be omitted, which they have a lawful right to demand.

" 5. Without professing to assert any right or power to authorise you to continue to perform any rites which have been declared to be unlawful, I so far respect the feelings of a large majority of your congregation as to refrain from urging you to bring all your services into exact and immediate agreement with the law.

" 6. But I do hereby require you to offer to those parishioners who desire

I have written to the Bishop of Lichfield and signified to him that I am ready to abide by his order, and to do as he has required me to do with regard to the manner in which I am hereafter to conduct Divine service in St. Andrew's Church.—I remain, my Lord Archbishop, your Grace's obedient servant,

“CHARLES BODINGTON.”

Some further letters followed with reference to the precise meaning of Mr. Bodington's undertaking, and on November 19 the Archbishop filed in his Provincial Registry a formal refusal to allow legal proceedings to go on. The document ran as follows:—

“We, Archibald Campbell, Archbishop of Canterbury, havin in pursuance of the provisions of the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, considered the whole circumstances attending the above representation, are of opinion that proceedings should not be taken thereon for the following reasons, namely,—That

“Whereas we have had a personal interview with the said Reverend Charles Bodington,

“And whereas we have since commnicated with him, through a special messenger sent to him by ourselves,

“And whereas we understand from him that in accordance with the direction contained in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, he is ready loyally to submit himself to the decision and order of the Bishop of the diocese, in regard to the matters now complained of, as to his mode of conducting Divine service in the Church of St. Andrew's, Wolverhampton,

“And whereas it appears to us that the said Reverend Charles Bodington, so far as we can learn, has from the time when he first entered on his ministry in the Church of St. Andrew, Wolverhampton, sought to be guided by the Bishop of his diocese, and to conform himself loyally to the said Bishop's decision and advice :

the ordinances of the Church to be performed in a strictly lawful manner, such convenient opportunities as may satisfy their just and reasonable demands.

“7. The principles upon which the letter is based apply to all Churches in which any addition or omission is customary in this performance of the services, rites, and ceremonies ordered by the Prayer-Book.—I remain, my dear Mr. Bodington, yours very faithfully,

G. A. LICHFIELD.”

“Therefore it seems to us right under the peculiar circumstances of this particular case, that before any proceedings under the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, be—upon this representation—commenced against the Reverend Charles Bodington, the Bishop of the diocese be personally called upon by the complainant or complainants, under the general Episcopal powers vested in him, as set forth in the Act of Uniformity, enforcing the provisions of the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, ‘to take order for the quieting and appeasing of all diversity, and for the resolution of all doubts, concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute the things contained in the Book of Common Prayer as regards the conduct of Divine service in the Church of St. Andrew, Wolverhampton, so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in the said book.’

“Dated this nineteenth day of November 1877, at Stonehouse, St. Peter’s, Thanet, in the County of Kent.

“A. C. CANTUAR.”

The complainants protested vehemently against the Archbishop’s decision, and again tried to initiate legal action both against Mr. Bodington and against another incumbent in his neighbourhood. The latter declined at first to accept the Archbishop’s invitation to an interview, but calmer counsels prevailed, and the Archbishop issued in each case a formal veto,¹ on the ground that the clergy in question had consented to obey the directions of their Diocesan, with whom the regulation of such disputed matters ought to rest. Bishop Selwyn died on April 11, 1878, and on Dr. Maclagan’s consecration to the See, a further endeavour was made to initiate legal proceedings. The voluminous correspondence which followed will be best summarised by quoting a few sentences from the Archbishop’s final letter upon this subject, addressed to the Churchwardens of the respective parishes:—

¹ Dated respectively 8th January 1878 and 2d February 1878.

" LAMBETH PALACE, S.E., *Feb.* 12, 1879.

" GENTLEMEN,—I have given my best attention to the papers which you have been good enough to forward to me. . . . You ask for my counsel and advice in the difficulties which have arisen respecting the mode of conducting public worship in the three Churches of which, respectively, each of you is one of the Churchwardens. First, let me say that I cannot but regret the tone of many of your remarks respecting the decision of the Bishop of your diocese, and the motives you impute to him. Such remarks usually tend only to embitter controversy, and lead to no good result. The Bishop of Lichfield has, at my request, been called upon to undertake a very difficult task in attempting to adjust the differences in question, and he has, in my judgment, applied himself to it in a truly Christian spirit. You are aware that in this attempt the Bishop is not acting with any power conferred on him by Statute or otherwise to enforce the law, but is merely endeavouring to bring about such an arrangement as may make the resort to litigation unnecessary. His Lordship has stated to you that in taking order for appeasing the diversities that have arisen, he is not to be understood as giving judgment as to what is strictly legal or illegal, authorised or unauthorised,—‘still less,’ he adds, ‘am I to be supposed to approve of all that I leave unaltered, or to be willing to permit or to forbid the continuance or introduction of similar practices in other churches and congregations without distinction. Under circumstances of extreme difficulty, arising from the somewhat unsettled condition of ecclesiastical decisions, and from the gradual upgrowth of various customs and practices in the Church of England, I am simply taking order for the present distress, according to the best of my judgment, and by my general episcopal powers, for the quieting of strife and appeasing of diversity, only taking care that nothing be ordered which is clearly contrary to the directions of the Book of Common Prayer.’ . . . As I understand the present circumstances of this case they are as follows :—The Bishop has enjoined that at all the ordinary services of the Church the requirements of the law shall be strictly complied with ; but the Bishop intimates that with respect to certain other services, which are, as I understand, conducted at an early hour in the morning, and are not likely, however they might be changed in character, to

be frequented by you or by those who share your feelings, he is not prepared to interfere with the arrangement made with his predecessor, and does not, therefore, use his authority in urging that they be brought into exact and immediate conformity with the law. Now, instead of your acquiescing in the amicable arrangement which your Bishop has endeavoured to effect, it is obviously possible for you, with the proper consents, to take steps for enforcing a rigid observance of the law at all the services. But the Public Worship Regulation Act has expressly provided that the consent of the Bishop or Archbishop, as the case may be, is required before such proceedings can be commenced under that Act, and this provision, unknown to the former law, was inserted with the express view of giving the Diocesan or Archbishop an opportunity of preventing mere vexatious litigation by withholding his authority, where the circumstances appear to him to warrant such a course, from an exact and peremptory enforcement of the letter of the Rubrics in every case, whether of omission from or of addition to the precise order prescribed in the time of Charles II. . . . Taking into consideration the whole circumstances of this complicated case, my advice to you is not to proceed further while matters remain as at present. If your statement is correct that there is 'a small congregation at St. Andrew's, and a still smaller at Christ Church,' and that this is owing to the manner in which Divine service is conducted in these churches, I can only express my great regret that the parishioners should have been alienated from their parish church, and my hope that the clergy will seriously consider whether there is anything in their teaching or practices calculated thus to alienate their parishioners. On the other hand, I would earnestly press upon you the solemn duty of abstaining from everything which can foment strife. I am sanguine enough to hope that the clergy of these Churches, and those of their parishioners who are now at variance with them, may, by God's blessing, come, before long, to a better understanding, so that they may loyally co-operate in furthering the work of Jesus Christ in full accordance with the laws and established usages of the Church of England. — I remain, gentlemen, yours faithfully,

A. C. CANTUAR."

The only other case which came in any way before the Archbishop in connection with the Public Worship

Regulation Act was the attempted prosecution of the Rev. Charles Lowder of St. Peter's, London Docks, in November 1878.¹ This prosecution he vetoed—"apart from other considerations"—upon the ground that the questions involved were at that moment the subject of appeal.

It has seemed well to show in some detail what was his method of dealing with these disputes when they came officially before him. He did not in any way make light of the questions involved, but he showed throughout that he had no desire to advocate, still less to enforce, a rigid uniformity, and that the paramount consideration in his mind was the recognition of some regulating authority to decide ritual disputes. If only a readiness were shown to yield to that authority, he was prepared to protect the clergy with all his might from the terrors, the costs, and the uncertainties of a Court of Law. Although the cases above named were the only ones in which he was called upon to take formal action, the knowledge of what would happen sufficed in his own diocese to prevent not a few other prosecutions which would in different circumstances have been initiated. Two of these in particular were threatened in several successive years, but the Archbishop's recurring answers to frivolous or malicious complaints served on the one hand to damp the ardour for litigation, and on the other, as a natural consequence, to restrain ritual extravagances on the part of those whom he thus protected.

One other case there was, with which the Archbishop had no official connection, but which, in consequence of the peculiar circumstances connected with it, caused wide indignation and excitement in the Church. On August

¹ The Bishop of London being patron of St. Peter's, it devolved upon the Archbishop—as in the Wolverhampton cases—to act in his place.

9, 1879, the Rev. R. W. Enraght, Vicar of Holy Trinity, Bordesley, was condemned by Lord Penzance, as Dean of Arches, for certain alleged ritual irregularities, one of these being the use of 'wafer-bread' in the Holy Communion. Some time after the trial was over, a statement became current that the specimen produced in Court as evidence was in reality a consecrated wafer delivered by Mr. Enraght to a communicant, in ordinary course, and by him abstracted and retained for the purposes of the prosecution. When it was produced in Court, counsel and judge were alike unaware that it had been thus obtained after consecration ; and, pending a possible appeal from the decision of Lord Penzance, the wafer was placed in the Registry of the Court of Arches along with documents and other materials of evidence. On the fact becoming known, the indignation of High Churchmen was naturally unbounded. Memorials were circulated everywhere, and shoals of such streamed into Lambeth, couched some of them in extravagant terms of humiliation and dismay. The Archbishop at first supposed that he would find no difficulty in having the consecrated wafer removed from the custody of the Court. But the legal technicalities interposed unexpected obstacles. It would be tedious to recount the petty difficulties which baffled his endeavours week after week, while the wrath of Churchmen generally was glowing at white heat. He expressed to one correspondent after another his disapproval of what had taken place :—

"If it be true," he wrote, "that a portion of the bread used in the celebration of the Holy Communion was, after consecration, surreptitiously removed from the Church by one of those to whom it had been administered in the Communion service, the conduct of the person so removing it was certainly most reprehensible."

At the same time, he deprecated as "alien to the spirit

of the Church of England's teaching on the subject, the inflated and overstrained language employed" in not a few of the 231 memorials which he received and answered.

Not till December 12 was an application made and acceded to in Court that the consecrated wafer should be handed over to the custody of the Archbishop himself. An officer of the Court took it at once to Addington, and half an hour later arrived an unexpected deputation of High Church leaders to ask for its possession, that it might be re-conveyed to Bordesley. The Archbishop replied that he had already "reverently consumed" it, and that he was writing to the Bishop of Worcester on the subject. The letter was as follows :—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of Worcester.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON, Dec. 12, 1879.

"MY DEAR LORD,—An application was, I understood, this day made in the Arches Court by the counsel for the promoters in the case of 'Perkins v. Enraght' for the delivery to them of all the documents and other exhibits which had been used as evidence in the case, on the ground that the time for appeal had passed, and the case might be now discharged.

"The Dean of the Arches having acceded to this application, a certain wafer, alleged to have been consecrated by Mr. Enraght, in the service of Holy Communion, instead of the bread directed by our Church to be employed for this purpose, was placed in my hands by request of the Proctors for the prosecution.

"I have taken care that the wafer should be reverently consumed, since, however irregular may have been the mode of administering the Holy Communion, the fact seems now clear to me, though in no way brought before the Court, that this wafer was used in that administration.

"I have therefore thought that it ought to be disposed of as the rubric directs.—Believe me, my dear Lord, yours very truly,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

So soon as the letter was made public the Archbishop

received almost as many expressions of enthusiastic gratitude as he had before received of indignation and dismay. Scarcely a prominent man belonging to the High Church party but contributed a letter to the pile, and as all who were with him in those weeks will remember, the enthusiasm evoked among a wide section of Churchmen, by what he himself regarded as a simple and straightforward act of comparative unimportance, distressed him almost as much as the correspondence which preceded it.

He refused, with unwonted sternness, to receive a deputation which desired to thank him, and he remonstrated privately with several of his memorialists:—

“There is surely,” he said to one, “some complete distortion or forgetfulness of the proportion of things, in the importance which has been attached both to this act of misguided and ignorant irreverence, and to the simple means by which the scandal has been ended. Will any Christian man, unless he is blinded either by superstition or by partisanship, dare to deny that these letters, with the outcry and strife they have fomented, are out of all proportion to the real importance of this misguided and wrong act? Can these clergy, in face of the glaring sins and vices of our day, be right in giving such a picture of what they deem to be the great and the little things of faith and life as these stand in the sight of Almighty God?”

CHAPTER XXVI.

GENERAL POLICY AND ACTION IN RITUAL MATTERS.

BISHOPS' PASTORAL—ORNAMENTS RUBRIC IN CONVOCATION—
LETTER TO CANON CARTER—RIDSDALE JUDGMENT—MEET-
INGS FOR UNITY—CROYDON CHURCH CONGRESS.

1875-1877.

THE last chapter has described the Archbishop's course in dealing with such specific charges of Ritual irregularity as came officially before him. In such action he had, to some extent, a free hand, and was able to regulate his procedure according to the peculiarities of each case as it arose. But, all the while, he had the far more difficult task of endeavouring to shape the general policy of the Church's rulers, and to withstand the brunt of the fiery and enthusiastic forces which pressed upon them at once from opposite sides. To understand the position properly, it must be remembered that the advocates of 'advanced' Ritual had not yet adopted the distinct policy of ignoring the decisions of the Court of Final Appeal. With the co-operation of High Churchmen¹ the constitution of that Court had lately been remodelled, and, though by no means satisfied even with its new shape, leaders like Dr. Pusey, Canon Carter, and others, had expressed an apparent readiness to bow to its decisions. "The new Final Court," wrote Dr. Pusey, "may reverse in some points (so lawyers tell us) the decisions of the old Court. . . . The

¹ See e.g. *Bishop Wilberforce's Life*, vol. iii. p. 418.

new Court is much larger, and has a distincter legal element than the old. . . . If we could be shown to be mistaken in thinking that certain usages are in conformity to the English formularies, we should, I suppose, find other ways of expressing a devotion to our Lord dearer to us than life.”¹

Canon Carter was still more explicit.

“It is a subject of deep regret,” he wrote,² “that, through a combination of circumstances into which it is impossible now to enter, the Court of Appeal has assumed its present shape, and that both the original constitution and the amended state of the existing Court are due to Acts of Parliament, without any reference to the Church in Convocation. But it is fair to note that the Church made no protest or remonstrance against these proceedings, neither through her Convocation nor through her Bishops in Parliament. We can hardly deny, therefore, that the arrangement has been virtually accepted through our representatives. And further, if we had now permission to constitute a court consisting of the spirituality alone, according to the terms of the compact under Henry VIII., we should have the extremest difficulty, in our divided state, in forming one satisfactory to the whole body of the Church—most difficulty of all in forming one satisfactory to High Churchmen. It is hardly a secret—the belief is rife—that the Purchas Judgment is due to the influence of the Episcopal members of the Court—that had it been left to the lay members it would have been more favourable to the Church party. Churchmen have considered it a boon that, by the recent change, Bishops are altogether excluded from the Court as Judges, and regret that they still remain as assessors. I write this with shame and sorrow; but it is needful to contemplate facts when we are anxiously considering present duty. It ought also to be remembered that High Churchmen, in the St. Paul and St. Barnabas case, welcomed the judgment of this Final Court as against the then adverse action of the Arches, and gladly profited by it. It is hardly fair now to reject the very existence of the Court because the facts happen to be reversed. We cannot play fast and loose, triumphing when the Court is favourable to us, utterly

¹ *Times*, March 19, 1874, and see above, p. 194.

² *Guardian*, March 18, 1874, p. 318.

condemning it when unfavourable. Neither, again, can it be urged that the Court of Appeal has forfeited its authority because it is composed of lay members, when the sole Judge of the Arches is a layman. . . . I hope nothing has been said to imply that I regard the existing Court of Appeal as satisfactory, or true to the Reformation settlement. At the same time, I also hope that it is not really inconsistent, while entirely agreeing with those who condemn the Court according to strict constitutional theory, yet to believe that, under the circumstances above stated, we are not in a condition to reject it as having no claim to judge, not, of course, *in foro conscientia*, but as an inevitable practical power with which we have to deal.”¹

High Churchmen in general seem to have regarded it as probable that the new and ‘improved’ Final Court would be likely to decide many points in their favour. A prominent representative of that school wrote to the Archbishop in January 1875 as follows :—

“I assume that the Church Association will put the Public Worship Act in force as soon as it comes into legal operation. The Church Union, I understand, will make no reprisals ; but reprisals will be made by independent parties. The Ritualists, being first attacked, will be the first to come before the new Court of Appeal, with the result, I have little doubt, of a decision in their favour on almost every point condemned by the Purchas Judgment. I have little doubt, on the other hand, that judgment will go against some rubrical transgressions on the other side. And then we shall have the deluge. The wild accusations of ‘lawlessness’ against the Ritualists, and, indeed, against the whole High Church party, have taken such possession of the public mind that when the Ritualists are proved to be in the main within the law, there will be a howl raised for altering the Prayer Book ; and if any such attempt is made, we shall certainly have disestablishment after the next general election.

“I believe that the Bishops have at this moment one of those

¹ For a similar expression of opinion, in even stronger terms, see a vigorous article in the *Church Quarterly Review* for October 1875, pp. 229-230. The authorship is usually attributed to Mr. Beresford Hope.

golden opportunities which, if allowed to slip, will never recur. Let them declare the Eastward position optional, and the use of the Eucharistic vestments permissible under certain conditions and restrictions. Let them declare at the same time that these things have no necessary connection with Popery, but are really an argument against it. What would be the result of such a policy? I believe that the country generally would acquiesce in it, if it had the support of the Episcopal Bench generally. And such a pressure would be brought to bear on the extreme Ritualists that the Bishops would be allowed an almost unrestricted discretion as to the use of the vestments so long as the *principle* was saved. It is a choice of difficulties, I admit; but it seems to me the one which involves the least danger. Leaving matters as they are will, I believe, inevitably result in a Judgment in favour of the Ritualists and against the Low Church and Broad Church parties."

It is clear that the Bishops had no reason at this stage to anticipate any general refusal on the part of the Ritualists to acquiesce in the expected Judgments of the New Court of Appeal. The 'Protestant' party, on the other hand, were clamorously calling on the Bishops to speak more strongly against 'Popish Ritual' and the like, and to put it down wherever necessary by the arm of law. Petitions were presented to the Episcopate and to Convocation, signed by nearly 4000 clergy in favour of such legislation as should give authoritative sanction to the use of vestments and other adjuncts of High Ritual. A counter-petition immediately appeared, signed by 5300 clergy who would "deeply deplore" any such sanction being given. Such were the circumstances of the opening months of 1875. The Public Worship Act of the previous year was not to come into operation until July 1st. In February the Bishops held their usual meetings before the opening of Parliament, and decided, after much discussion, to issue a joint Pastoral Letter to the Church. It was no easy task for the Archbishop to obtain a general agree-

ment as to the terms of such a document. It had to be done by correspondence as well as by debate, and the residuum of letters, about seventy-five in number, which the Archbishop regarded as worth keeping, give a curious picture of the perseverance with which he adhered, in spite of obstacles, to his determination that such a Pastoral should be issued before the new Act came into operation. Only two names, and these for opposite reasons, were ultimately withheld. Bishop Moberly of Salisbury and Bishop Baring of Durham refused to sign. The former explained his reasons in the *Guardian*,¹ and the latter in the *Record*. Bishop Baring's private note to the Archbishop was as follows :—

“ 22d Feb. 1875.

“ MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,—I am very sorry I cannot sign. It is a perilous experiment when a patient is suffering from a dangerous fever to treat it as a slight cold, and administer only a little weak milk and water.—Yours very truly,

“ C. DUNELM.”

There can be no doubt that the address as finally agreed upon was open to such an accusation as the above on the part of the hotter partisans on either side. But the indignation it aroused, in more than one quarter, was itself an evidence that it had not quite missed fire. It was as follows :—

“ LAMBETH PALACE, 1st March 1875.

“ WE the undersigned Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England, under a deep sense of the duty that rests

¹ Bishop Moberly, as he explained, had only withdrawn at the last moment the signature which he had authorised the Archbishop to append. He fully agreed, however, in desiring some joint utterance on the part of the Bishops which should “distinctly declare their determination to maintain the principles of the Reformed Church of England, and to uphold the law when finally pronounced.”

upon us of endeavouring to guide those committed to our pastoral charge, desire to address some words of counsel and exhortation to the clergy and laity of our dioceses in the grave circumstances of the present time.

“We acknowledge, humbly and thankfully, the mercies vouchsafed by Almighty God to the Church of England. By His blessing on the labours of the clergy and laity our Church has of late been enabled in a marvellous manner to promote His glory, and to advance His kingdom, both at home and abroad. If we judge by external signs—the churches built, restored, and endowed during the last forty years; the new parishes formed in that time, especially in our great towns and cities; the vast sums of money voluntarily contributed for the promotion of religious education; the extension of the Church in the colonies and in foreign countries, including the foundation of more than fifty new sees; the great increase in the number of persons of all classes who by prayers and labour assist in the work of converting souls to Christ, all bear witness to the zeal and earnestness of the clergy and laity of the English Church,—an earnestness and zeal which we rejoice to know is by no means confined to any section or party. We may humbly trust that the inward work of the Holy Spirit of God in the hearts of men, a work which He alone can measure, has been great in proportion to these outward efforts.

“While, however, we thankfully recognise these abundant mercies and blessings, we cannot but acknowledge with sorrow that serious evils disturb the peace of the Church, and hinder its work.

“One of these evils is the interruption of the sympathy and mutual confidence which ought to exist between the clergy and laity. Changes in the mode of performing Divine service, in themselves sometimes of small importance, introduced without authority, and often without due regard to the feelings of parishioners, have excited apprehensions that greater changes are to follow; distrust has been engendered, and the edification which ought to result from united worship has been impeded. The suspicions thus aroused, often no doubt unreasonable, have in some cases produced serious alienation.

“The refusal to obey legitimate authority is another evil in the Church at the present time. Not only has it frequently occurred that clergymen fail to render to Episcopal authority that

submission which is involved in the idea of Episcopacy, but obedience has been avowedly refused to the highest judicial interpretations of the law of this Church and realm. Even the authority which our Church claims, as inherent in every particular or National Church, to ordain and change rites and ceremonies, has been questioned and denied.

"We also observe, with increasing anxiety and alarm, the dissemination of doctrines and encouragement of practices repugnant to the teaching of Holy Scripture, and to the principles of the Church, as derived from Apostolic times, and as authoritatively set forth at the Reformation. More especially we call serious attention to the multiplication, and the assiduous circulation among the young and susceptible, of manuals of doctrine and private devotion, of which it is not too much to say that many of the doctrines and practices they inculcate are wholly incompatible with the teaching and principles of our reformed Church.

"Further, we feel it our duty to call attention to the growing tendency to associate doctrinal significance with rites and ceremonies which do not necessarily involve it. For example, the position to be occupied by the minister during the Prayer of Consecration in the Holy Communion, though it has varied in different ages and different countries, and has never been formally declared by the Church to have any doctrinal significance, is now regarded by many persons of very opposite opinions as a symbol of distinctive doctrine, and, as such, has become the subject of embittered controversy.

"We would seriously remind our brethren of the clergy of the solemn obligation that binds us all to be ready to yield a willing obedience to the law of the Church of England, of which we are ordained ministers, and to recognise the necessity of submitting our own interpretations of any points in that law which may be considered doubtful to the judicial decisions of lawfully-constituted courts. We, the clergy, are bound by every consideration to obey the law when thus clearly interpreted; and to decline to obey, when called upon by lawful authority, is to set an example that cannot fail to be most injurious in its influence and effects. We are convinced that the number of those who would refuse such reasonable obedience is small, and that the vast majority of the clergy and laity of the Church of England are thoroughly loyal to its doctrine and discipline. We fully recognise the difference between unity and an over-strained uniformity, and

are well aware that our Church is rightly tolerant of diversity, within certain limits, both in opinions and practices. We would not narrow in the least this wise comprehensiveness, but liberty must not degenerate into licence and self-will; as fundamental truths must not be explained away, so neither must those clear lines be obliterated which separate the doctrines and practices of our reformed Church from the novelties and corruptions of the Church of Rome.

“We live in an age which prides itself on freedom of thought and emancipation from the control of authority. In every portion of Christendom men are more disposed than ever to run into extremes of opinion and practice. While, on the one hand, fundamental truths are increasingly neglected or denied, vain attempts, on the other, are made in many quarters to meet this infidelity by the revival of superstition.

“Under these grave circumstances we solemnly charge you all, brethren beloved in the Lord, to cultivate a spirit of charity and mutual forbearance, laying aside dissension and disputes which must issue not in the victory of one party over another, but in the triumph of the enemies of the Church, and, indeed, of those who are enemies to the faith of Christ. We exhort the clergy not to disquiet their congregations by novel practices and unauthorised ceremonies, and to discountenance those who seek to introduce them. We entreat the laity not to give way to suspicions in regard of honest efforts to promote the more reverent worship of Almighty God in loyal conformity to the rules of the Book of Common Prayer. Surely this is not a time for estrangement, but rather for drawing closer the bonds between the clergy and their parishioners, when vice, ignorance, infidelity, and intemperance are calling for united prayer and united effort on the part of all who hold the faith of Christ crucified, and love and serve Him as their common Lord.

“Let us all, then, both clergy and laity, be faithful to the doctrine and discipline of our Church, founded as they are on Holy Scripture, and in accordance with the teaching and practice of the primitive Church. We entreat all whom our words may reach to strive together with us in prayer to Almighty God, that as there is but one Body, and one Spirit, and one hope of our calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of us all, so we may henceforth be all of one heart and of one soul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and

charity, and may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

A. C. CANTUAR., W. EBOR., J. LONDON, E. H. WINTON., A. LLANDAFF, R. RIPON, JOHN T. NORWICH, J. C. BANGOR, H. WORCESTER, C. J. GLOUC. and BRISTOL, WILLIAM CHESTER, T. L. ROFFEN., G. A. LICHFIELD, J. HEREFORD, W. C. PETERBOROUGH, C. LINCOLN, ARTHUR C. BATH AND WELLS, F. EXON., HARVEY CARLISLE, J. F. OXON., J. MANCHESTER, R. CICESTR., J. ST. ASAPH, J. R. ELY, W. BASIL ST. DAVID'S, HORACE SODOR AND MAN.

If the Evangelical extremists, headed by Bishop Baring, condemned the Bishops' Pastoral on the one side, it was denounced with equal vehemence on the other by the advance-guard of the High Church party. Reference has already been made to the Archbishop's intimacy with Mother Harriet,¹ Superior of the Clewer Sisterhood, with whom he maintained for many years a constant correspondence, and who was a frequent guest at Addington and Lambeth.

No sooner did the Pastoral appear than she wrote to him as follows :—

Mrs. Monsell to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“CLEWER, *March 10, 1875.*

“MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,¹—I cannot be good and keep silence. Your ‘Irish Cousin’ cannot contain the Celtish spirit within her. What will the English Episcopate gain by sending the Eastern, the Western Church, the civilised heathen all over the world, such an estimate of their clergy? I have seen no paper, know not how your sons will take it, but your daughter feels very much aggrieved for them. The poor Bp. of Salisbury

¹ The Hon. Mrs. Monsell, widow of the Rev. Charles Monsell, and cousin of Mrs. Tait. See vol. i. p. 450. She died March 25, 1883.

shivers at finding himself alone, but anyhow he has the satisfaction of having spoken in a friendly way of his Diocese. . . . Do please set things a little straight in Convocation, and claim for the English Church her catholic position as a branch of the Primitive Church. Do not be vexed with me, dear Archbishop. I see life from the foot of the tree, you from the top. If you let the life-blood of the tree flow out where I stand, or get paralysed in dejection, the topmost boughs will soon wither. The iron hand of law will never rule the Church when the flow of mutual confidence and sympathy has been cut through. Your Pastoral comes like an icicle into the hearts of your sons, and they say, 'What would the Army or Navy or Bar say if the the Generals and Admirals and Judges sent out to the world such a paper?' You know I have always maintained that the ground for it crumbles into a few chips on any minute examination of it; and the good sense of England, with a trusting Episcopate, would have lighted them.

"I would not venture to write if Convocation was not at hand, and an opportunity of repairing the wound given.—Ever yours very affectionately,
H. MONSELL."

The Archbishop's reply to this letter has unfortunately not been preserved, but its tenor may be gathered from a further and a very beautiful private letter of Mrs. Monsell's, in which she thanks him for what he had told her of his own anxious thoughts and prayers upon the subject of the Pastoral. She adds—

"Those I am bound up with, and who represent the calm side of High Churchmen of Bishop Andrewes's school of thought, feel there is a phase of things among a few that will never find a true home in the English Church, but they are only a few, and it is not easy for those most linked with them to say exactly who they are, for in a transition state people take up things with fervour, and then, having tested their real value, lay them down again. . . . There is no doubt a firm hand in the Rulers is most desirable."

Other letters, not a few, came from prominent High

Churchmen in various parts of England. Nearly all of them were of a private and confidential character, but they served at least to put the Archbishop in fullest possible possession of the views of those whose line of action had been criticised in the Bishops' Pastoral.

Convocation met, and in the debates upon the Revision of the Rubrics, the Ritual question came prominently forward. Three years had now elapsed since Convocation was authorised by a 'Royal Letter of Business' "to debate, consider, consult and agree upon" such changes as might be desirable in the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, "and more especially with regard to the ornaments used, . . . and the vestments worn by the ministers";¹ but the time had so far been mainly occupied with rubrics of a less controversial nature, and not till now had any serious effort been made to grapple with the formidable question of the Ornaments Rubric. No sooner was this particular task attempted than both parties in the Church became alarmed lest the ambiguous Rubric should be so explained as to controvert their particular interpretation of it. The tables of Convocation were loaded with petitions, and the issue of many committees and much debate was a resolve to leave unaltered the troublesome Rubric on which so many strifes had hinged. The decision caused not a little surprise, and provoked, indeed, the unconcealed merriment of many outside critics. Grave as were the questions involved, there was certainly an almost ludicrous side to the picture of the sacred Synod, which had obtained State authority to replace an obscure and controverted Rubric by something less ambiguous, resolving, after years of debate, that it would be better to leave the mysterious words alone,

¹ The Letter of Business was first issued (as the natural sequel of the Ritual Commission) on February 7, 1872, and was renewed under Mr. Disraeli's Government in 1874.

and to pass on to other matters.¹ It would be out of place to discuss here the wisdom or the necessity of this resolve. All that can be done is to show how Archbishop Tait regarded it. He had originally been entirely in favour of such a remodelling of the Ornaments Rubric as should make its directions, whatever they might be, unambiguous and indisputable. He had supported such a proposal first in the Ritual Commission and afterwards at Bishops' meetings and in the Upper House of Convocation. But he had gradually become convinced that in the excitement which was aroused by the petitions and meetings on the subject any calm consideration of the question was impossible, and he desired therefore to postpone the re-wording of the Rubric until quieter days. It was his belief, as has been already shown—a belief destined to disappointment—that the clergy would in the meantime accept such interpretations of the disputed Rubric as might be given in the newly formed Court of Appeal, a body to whose action High Churchmen were looking hopefully forward, and he therefore acquiesced the more readily in the disappointing change of front which the shelving of this exasperating question involved. In an important Convocation speech on April 13, 1875,² he said :—

“I feel convinced that your lordships, and I may say the

¹ It is impossible to summarise without sacrifice of accuracy the long and careful resolutions of the Lower House upon the subject. They will be found *in extenso* in the *Chronicle of Convocation*, July 5, 1875, p. 281. The resolution of the Upper House ran as follows :—“That this House acknowledges the careful and patient consideration which the Lower House has given to the difficult subject of the Ornaments Rubric and the Rubrics governing the position of the minister during the celebration of Holy Communion ; and, believing legislation on these points to be at the present time neither desirable nor practicable, does not deem it expedient now to discuss the course which any such legislation should take, or the principles according to which it should be regulated.”—*Chronicle of Convocation*, 1875, p. 298.

² *Chronicle of Convocation*, April 13, 1875, p. 8.

great body of the clergy, are ready to accept whatever may be the final decision upon this subject, not placing their own individual predilections above the decisions of those to whom God has given authority, but being willing loyally to abide not only by the common law of the Church of England as it stands at present, but also by those interpretations of it, whatever they may be, which are arrived at by the competent authorities which the Church and the State acknowledge. I can have no doubt that even though this be a time of considerable excitement, when a good deal of angry feeling has been evoked, yet the general sound loyalty of the Church of England is ready to accept in this matter whatever shall be finally decided to be the law of the Church."

And, again, a few months later (on July 6, 1875):¹—

"No sensible man who has to do with legislation, whatever he may desire in the abstract, thinks of proceeding to legislate if public opinion is entirely against his doing so. That is exactly the position in which we are with regard to this question. It is not the wish of the Church or country that we should legislate. . . . I therefore think that, looking to the nature of the questions, and to the excitement of men's minds on the subject at the present time, even though there is an ambiguity in the words of these rubrics, as there is in a great many other passages in the Prayer Book, it is better to tolerate this ambiguity than to rush into any attempt at legislation which may stir up much party feeling. . . . The fact is that we must not gloze over the difficulty which we really lie under in this matter. There are certain most estimable, and in one sense most excellent men, who upon this subject seem to have taken leave of all their common sense and good feeling, and they are determined to have their own way, which they believe to be the way of the undivided Church of Christ in this matter, whatever the Reformed Church may think of teaching; and it will never do to shut our eyes to there being such persons in existence at the present time. . . . This may be the last opportunity that we shall have of publicly expressing our feelings towards those who seem determined to act in a somewhat self-willed spirit with reference to the sort of changes which are contemplated in the discussion that is brought

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, July 6, 1875, p. 318, etc.

on by these resolutions. I myself, from circumstances which I cannot fully explain, have been all my life long more or less mixed up with persons of all sorts of opinions, and I have learnt, therefore, as much perhaps as any man, to appreciate the goodness and holiness of those of whom we are speaking. . . . I quite allow that there has been blame upon all sides; I allow that the very system according to which our Church has been administered has encouraged people very much to decide these questions for themselves. I think they have thereby learnt a great deal too much to decide them for themselves. One of your lordships said that there were persons of this description, who, having it set before them whether they would obey Cæsar or the Church, determined they would obey the Church, and not Cæsar. But my experience of late has been, that they did not care any more for the Church when it went against their opinions than they cared for Cæsar, and that Cæsar was very often thought to be the more convenient instrument when he could enable them by a *mandamus* or otherwise to resist the authority of the Church. It is not, in my judgment, a question of ecclesiastical or civil authority, but it is a question of 'My will, and the will of the party to which I belong, as opposed to the constituted authorities of the great Society of which I am minister.' Having said much which may appear unkind, I say we are ourselves greatly responsible for having allowed them to get into this frame of mind. . . . From the very fact that the watchword of the age is toleration and freedom of opinion, there has been an encouragement to everybody to think and do exactly as he pleases in these matters. Therefore the blame is perhaps not so great as it might otherwise have been. But now that attention is called to it, now that you have the unmistakeable voice, first, let me say, of this great Christian country, secondly of the constituted magistrates of the Church, the Bishops, of the fathers in God whom it is nominally the pride of these persons to appeal to as the successors of the Apostles,—when you have their voice perfectly distinct,—when you have the constituted courts of law, whether they be the Court of the Bishop, the Court of the Archbishop, or the Supreme Court of Appeal, all expressing the same opinion, and when in appealing, as the last resort, to the Lower House of Convocation, you find them also laying down, with the utmost distinctness, that these things are not to be done without

the sanction of the Episcopal ruler of each diocese, surely those persons must be convinced that in common justice to themselves, and to the cause which they hold at heart, they must be more moderate, more considerate of other people's feelings, and more anxious to show in practice that deference to ecclesiastical authority of which they make their boast."

The practical result of the discussions of 1875 was that the Ornaments Rubric was to be, as one speaker described it, "severely let alone." But the question was re-opened two years later. The formal answer to the 'Letter of Business' had not yet been sent in, and the Lower House resolved, on April 25, 1877—

"That it is desirable that many Rubrics, and those especially which have been the subject of litigation, should be cleared from ambiguity by the constitutional action of the Convocations and of Parliament, but that such legislation cannot be safely entered upon until some safeguards are devised against the possibility of changes affecting the worship of the Church becoming law by the action of Parliament alone, without the consent of Convocation."¹

The suggested "safeguards" were not specified, but with this security against hasty legislation the Lower House proceeded, a few weeks later, to recommend what was known at the time as the 'Cope compromise.' The Ridsdale Judgment had been pronounced on May 12, authorising the 'Eastward position,' but forbidding the Eucharistic vestments, and this decision was regarded as justifying a new departure in the controversy. On July 5, after a long debate, the Lower House resolved, by 41 votes against 5, to recommend an addition to the Ornaments Rubric, authorising the use, with the Bishop's consent, of a cope only (not a chasuble or 'vestment') in

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, April 25, 1877, p. 87.

celebrations of the Holy Communion.¹ Upon the following day, before the Bishops had an opportunity of considering this new suggestion, Convocation was prorogued.

In the meantime the Archbishop had been in public correspondence with Canon Carter of Clewer, who in February 1877 addressed to him in pamphlet form a weighty remonstrance on the subject both of Ritual and of Courts. The Archbishop replied in a long and careful letter, which was published as a pamphlet under the title of *The Church and Law*. It expresses so clearly the position he had taken in the matter that it may be well to quote in full some of the salient passages which deal with the Ritual question :—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Canon Carter.

“ADDINGTON PARK, *March 2, 1877.*

“MY DEAR MR. CARTER,—I have read your printed letter addressed to me, which reached me yesterday. I cannot but feel much for the ‘sore distress’ which you state has been caused to yourself and others by events which have lately occurred in our Church. You will not doubt that, differing from you in many most important points, I have full sympathy for all those who, like yourself, are endeavouring with much self-denial to do God’s work in the way which best approves itself to their consciences. I am glad that you should freely express to me your thoughts on the present condition of our Church, and nothing, I assure you, shall be wanting on my part to secure to yourself and your friends that ‘fair play’ which you at present think some are not disposed to accord to you. Certainly you are right in maintaining that our Church has in no

¹ The words were—“In saying any public prayers, or ministering the sacraments and other rites of the Church, the minister shall wear a surplice with a stole or scarf and the hood of his degree; and in preaching he shall wear a surplice with a stole or scarf and the hood of his degree, or, if he think fit, a gown with hood and scarf. Nevertheless, he that ministereth in the Holy Communion may use, with the surplice and stole, a cope; provided always that such cope shall not be introduced into any church, other than a cathedral or collegiate church, without the consent of the Bishop.”

respect sanctioned a departure from the usages handed down to us from the 'primitive and purest times,' and that it is our desire 'with reverence to retain those ceremonies which do neither endanger the Church of God nor offend the minds of sober men.' . . . Nothing could be more unfair than to treat with harshness those members of our Church who, in the present day, conscientiously believe that they are upholding the teaching of such men as Bishop Andrewes. You must, however, allow me, whilst acknowledging the soundness of your premise in this matter, to find some fault with your particular application of it to the ritual observances which have lately caused so much dissension within our Church. . . . I ought to say, in reference to that part of your letter which treats of ritual, that, citing the authoritative declarations, explaining the principles on which our formularies were originally constructed, or from time to time amended, by reference to Catholic antiquity, you seem to me unwarrantably to have deduced from these declarations the dangerous principle that private individuals are entitled to add to the prescribed ceremonial of our Church any ceremonies which they themselves, or the circle of divines among whom they move, believe to be consonant with Catholic usage. In condemning, for example, the dictum of the judges that by 'necessary implication a rubric must be construed as abolishing what it does not retain,' you seem to me to lose sight of the very object of rubrics, constructed with the view of securing a becoming amount of uniformity. Because it is granted that the general laws of the country are not to be held as forbidding practices of which they make no mention, you hurry to the conclusion that rubrics also may be interpreted in the same manner.

"Let me ask you to consider what would be the spectacle exhibited by a regiment which, according to its regimental orders, was bound to wear a certain uniform, if every soldier or knot of soldiers was at liberty to add to the prescribed dress any ornaments or accoutrements which might approve themselves to the fancy of the individual or his friends. You cannot, I think, gravely doubt that rubrical directions are in the main intended to prescribe a uniform system, and to exclude, as a general rule, ceremonies which they do not sanction. What would soon become the condition of our churches if some such general rule of uniformity were not acted on? You cannot, I think, be aware of the distress which has been caused to many

pious souls by the unauthorised introduction in parish churches of unusual practices, not sanctioned by the Prayer Book, in the holiest rite of Christian worship. You cannot mean to contend that every clergyman, or knot of clergymen, is entitled to alter the prescribed form of administering the Holy Communion by adding whatever gestures, postures, dresses, or other ceremonial may be believed to be consonant with the usages of Catholic antiquity? To allow this would be fatal to the peace of the Church of England, and alienate thousands upon thousands of its most attached members. No one in authority wishes to impose upon all clergymen and all parishes a rigidly prescribed ceremonial unvarying in every particular. Our rubrics are constructed with such wise elasticity that room may be found within their limits for the gorgeous worship of the cathedral and the simplicity of the most unadorned homely parish church. And I can quite understand your feelings of alarm if you believe that the authorities in our Church, judicial or executive, have ever intended to restrain such innocent 'hereditary usages of the English Church,' 'some of real importance, some tending to reverence in what had to be done in some way or other, where yet no directions whatever were given.' . . . It gives me pleasure to find that, as I understand the letter you have sent to me, you hold out no encouragement to those who would seek to establish their views of Church order and ritual by a violent resistance to the existing authorities of the Church. It would have been strange if you had sanctioned the intemperate and foolish proposal to obey no court or authority in the Church or realm, so long as such courts and other authorities are bound to conform to the interpretations of law given by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Your authority is deservedly so great with a large section of Churchmen, that I fully trust and believe you will be able to restrain many who without your guidance might be led into self-willed and dangerous courses, injurious to their own souls and to the Church which we all love. If the reports published are correct, there are ungodly men who of late, under a pretence of conscience, have dishonoured God's House, some of them by showing their disdain for the regular services of the Church of England, while ostentatiously using, during the time of Divine service, their private books of so-called Catholic devotion, and otherwise interrupting the worship; others violently resisting such persons, and taking upon themselves formally to

order the ritual against the wishes of the clergyman licensed by the Bishop. I know that you agree with me in looking with disgust on both of these offences against law and order. . . . Let me say, in conclusion, that I will gladly, God helping me, bear my part in any well-considered and wise reforms by which our Church's efficiency may be increased, by which the help of the Holy Spirit may be better secured to it, and our whole system brought into more complete conformity with the model of apostolic purity. What I urge upon you is that great humility and caution is required before you plunge into unknown organic changes. Our Church, as hitherto constituted, has secured for us a well-ordered system and innumerable Christian privileges, and we must not lightly endanger them from a love of change.

"I do not find in your pamphlet much allusion to the doctrines of the Church of England. The present dissatisfaction and difference of opinion which has come prominently before the public, has reference directly to matters of ritual, which only secondarily involve questions of doctrine. No doubt, it is for the doctrines which the condemned ritual is supposed to typify that so much feeling has been elicited on both sides in recent controversies. I should deprecate as strongly as yourself any attempt to narrow the limits of allowable doctrine within the Church of England, so as to exclude any form of opinion which has been sanctioned in our Church from the Reformation downwards. The Church of England, like the people of England, will never return to the errors of Rome ; while it protests solemnly against such unbelieving expositions of the Christian faith as would reduce the religion of Christ to the rank of a mere human philosophy, it will never from fear of infidelity ally itself with an exploded superstition. It seems, *e.g.*, absolutely certain that the Church of England will not tolerate within its pale doctrines which base themselves on the Romish theory of transubstantiation, or on such an exaggeration of the powers of the priestly office as would introduce habitual auricular confession amongst our people. But I see no tendency in the decisions of our courts to sanction new limitations. There is, of course, a point beyond which it is dangerous to allow liberty of opinion on one side or the other, lest liberty degenerate into licence : but between the two dangerous extremes which the Church condemns, there is, and always has been, an ample field for that truly Catholic variety of sentiment which has been found in every

intelligent and widely-extended Church of Christ, from the days of the Apostles downwards. May I urge upon you, in the interests of Catholic liberty itself, how important it is, at the present time, that all whom you can influence should have their attention directed to the danger they run of having their liberty curtailed if they take any rash steps? Many of them desire doubtless to indoctrinate, if not to identify, the whole Church of England with their own peculiar views. Our Church is on its guard against such an attempt, but still is very tolerant of individual eccentricities of opinion, doubtless in the charitable hope that with good and earnest men things will right themselves at last. I know no other Church in Christendom where the maintainers of such opinions will be treated with so much fairness and tenderness. It is a matter for grave and very serious consideration how far any great change in the present constitution, likely to be sanctioned by the majority of Churchmen and the nation, would not press very heavily on extreme High Churchmen. The Church of England as at present constituted wishes to treat them with all fairness, but would not endure their assuming a supremacy.

“I would urge them to take this opportunity of carefully reconsidering their present position, and of judging themselves, lest in any respect they have been misled by the clamours of an unreflecting enthusiasm, and are contending for matters which have no warrant in the Word of God or the decisions of the Apostolic Church Catholic. There is at present much cause to fear injury to themselves, as well as disunion and confusion in the Church of which they are members, if they come to be regarded by the overwhelming majority of Churchmen as persons who, holding opinions dangerous to their own souls, are bent on propagating them both within and beyond the limits of the law in a Church which loves the Reformation and steadily adheres to its tenets.

“For myself, I would gladly secure for them all fair liberty within the Church, and I have much hope that their goodness will at last prevail over their errors. I desire that we should retain the services of their earnestness and self-devotion, and bring them back to the simplicity of the Faith. The dangers which threaten Christianity from sin and infidelity without are too great to allow us to look with indifference on divisions within. But, as I have said, there must be a limit to the Church’s forbearance, and I confess to much fear lest the inter-

perate and lawless acts and words of earnest men may do both them and us and the cause of Christianity irreparable mischief.

"That God of His goodness may by His Holy Spirit guide and preserve His Church at this anxious time is, I know, my dear Mr. Carter, your earnest prayer, as it is mine.—Yours very faithfully,
A. C. CANTUAR."

This letter, published a few weeks before the Ridsdale Judgment was pronounced, did undoubted service in inducing a calmer tone of controversy. It was certain that the Judgment, whatever it might be, would provoke keen opposition upon one side or the other. The Archbishop, although certainly no expert in ritual matters, had been taking an active and sustained interest in this particular appeal. The new rules about Episcopal Assessors had for the first time come into operation,¹ and the friends of Mr. Ridsdale urged that as the suit belonged to the Diocese of Canterbury, the Archbishop ought not to sit. The following extracts from his Diary explain the line he thought it right to take :—

Diary.

"ADDINGTON, 28th Jan. 1877.—Each day I have been some six hours in the Privy Council hearing interminable speeches on the Folkestone Appeal. We have had ten Judges and five Episcopal Assessors under the new Act. Great efforts were made by the Ritualists to prevent my sitting, but their counsel declared they would throw up their brief if the objections were pressed. My three chief reasons for sitting were these :—*1st*, It did not seem decorous that in a case of so much general interest only the four Junior Bishops should attend, who had no experience of the Court, whereas I have served on it for twenty years. *2nd*, Much depends for the future on the Episcopal Assessors having their proper place assigned on this their first sitting. I knew that the lawyers would endeavour to push them to the wall, and I thought it right that they should be headed by myself who

¹ See p. 202.

am the senior member of the Privy Council on the board. 3rd, I felt that, in the event of a relaxation of the Purchas Judgment being made, such change would be more palatable to the Evangelicals if they knew that I approved it. The law forbidding the Bishop of the Diocese to sit has been deliberately altered, and such an exclusion would be ridiculous where, as under the Public Worship Regulation Act, the Bishop is no longer the prosecutor. In this, as in other points, it is most important that a wise precedent should be established on this the first occasion of summoning Episcopal Assessors. The work has been wearing. The *Times* complains that it is an utter waste of judicial strength; but this is not so, if by a calm hearing of a Court, whose decisions must command respect, present agitation may be allayed. Meanwhile, the English Church Union has taken up the absurd position of defying all authority, and Mr. Tooth has been sent to prison for contempt of Court in refusing to admit the Bishop's nominee to do service in his Church, ignoring his own suspension for disobedience to the law. Let us pray God that these contentions may cease, and men come to a more sober mind. . . .

"Feb. 4th, 1877.— . . . From Monday at 11 o'clock to Thursday at 4 I was occupied all the daylight in the further hearing of the Ridsdale Appeal in the Council Chamber. I am very glad I attended, for obviously without my presence and place at the table as a Privy Councillor, the Ecclesiastical Assessors might have fared badly amongst the ten chiefs of the law. As it turned out, our position was clearly defined and maintained. We are to send in conjointly our separate opinion on the whole case, and I have urged, apparently with effect, that the wording also of the Judgment will be all the better if carefully looked over with us.

"Friday from 11 to 6 was occupied at Lambeth in careful review by myself and the four other Assessors, with continual references to authorities from the Lambeth Library.

"Saturday I was busy from 11 to 3.30 in dictating my report for the judges, and to-morrow we expect to sit and work again. The evenings have been spent quietly at Lambeth, and we have refreshed ourselves by reading *The Ring and the Book*. It has been very difficult to prevent letters from getting into arrear while this case has been going on, and I have had to postpone my Diocesan Conference. Pray God to bring peace and prosperity to the Church out of these troubles."

There was yet another public correspondence which attracted wide attention before the Ridsdale Judgment was pronounced. On April 4, 1877, the Archbishop received a formal protest or declaration signed by about eighty representative High Churchmen, headed by the Dean of St. Paul's:—

“We venture,” said the Memorialists, “to express to your lordships, as our spiritual fathers, the great anxiety and distress which we feel at the present position of affairs. . . . Believing, as we do, in the presence in the Church of her Divine Head, we are convinced that what is required is not the mere interpretation, however skilful, of existing law, but the living voice of the Church clearly laying down what the law shall be in the future.

“With this conviction upon our minds, we beg to urge upon your consideration that, in our opinion, no peace can be secured for the Church, nor can her existing relations with the State be long continued, unless laws for the regulation of Divine service, and for other spiritual matters of primary importance, are made by an authority which both clergy and laity would feel to be binding upon conscience; and we are equally satisfied that no authority will be considered thus binding which does not proceed from the Synods of the Church as well as from Parliament.”

To this address the Archbishop replied as follows:—

“ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
April 7, 1877.

“MY DEAR DEAN OF ST. PAUL’S,—I beg leave to acknowledge an address to the Archbishops and Bishops, dated Easter Tuesday, 1877, which you have been kind enough to forward to me.

“I confess myself not quite able to follow the exact meaning of some parts of this address, which probably, like other similar addresses, has been signed by different persons attaching somewhat different meanings to its statements. In particular, I am of opinion that it does not accurately distinguish between ecclesiastical matters judicial and ecclesiastical matters legislative—the former of which are, according to our present con-

stitution, conducted in a regular gradation of Ecclesiastical Courts, culminating in the Sovereign advised by the Privy Council, such Ecclesiastical Courts being jealously kept distinct from the ordinary civil tribunals of the realm. I shall, however, I presume, not be wrong in concluding that you desire some alteration of the present arrangement of these courts ecclesiastical, though you do not specify, with any accuracy, the sort of alterations which you think desirable.

"But I gather that the main object of the address is to urge that matters of legislation affecting the Church in its rights or ceremonies and controversies of faith should always be submitted to Convocation. It is not alleged that this principle has in any specific case been violated, and perhaps it has escaped your attention that for the last five years, ever since Convocation adopted the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act in 1872, it has been engaged in a task such as that which you rightly consider to be its peculiar function, having been called by the authority of the Crown to revise the rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer, a work which it has not yet accomplished.

"I need scarcely say that I shall take the earliest opportunity of laying the address which you have forwarded to me before my brethren of the Episcopal Bench, and in their name I can at once take upon myself to assure you that it will receive most attentive consideration.—Believe me to be, my dear Dean of St. Paul's, yours very truly,
A. C. CANTUAR."

After writing this letter the Archbishop invited the Memorialists to meet him at Lambeth, and explain their views by word of mouth. His Diary recounts the interview:—

"ADDINGTON PARK, *April* 22, 1877.—The chief event of this week has been my Conference with the High Church Memorialists in the Guard Room at Lambeth. They received a special invitation from me, that I might better understand what they wanted. Some sixty in all were present: Maclagan, Wilkinson, Lightfoot, Dean of Wells, and Craufurd were the only persons present who had not signed the declaration. The speaking was very moderate, except on the part of —, who was disposed to die on the floor of the room rather than submit to something which he

could not quite explain. I think on the whole good was done by the meeting. The papers handed in will be laid before the Bishops."

As the time approached for the judgment on the Ridsdale appeal, the Archbishop received letters from all sides, beseeching him to avert such a "national disaster" as this or that decision would involve. Dr. Pusey, for example, wrote :—

"Your Grace, who has always given me a hearing hitherto, will excuse my writing now in consequence of a rumour which much distresses me. It is, that the Judicial Committee are going to condemn the use of what are called the 'Vestments.' . . . I have been long looking forward to this review of the Purchas Judgment, because I hoped that it would bring peace, and that, although it might satisfy neither party, congregations would have to tolerate one another in what each found for its edification. . . ."

After a careful argument in favour of the legality of the impugned ritual, he continues—

"If there is any truth in the rumours, I hope it is not too late for the Final Court of Appeal to reconsider its decision (if it has made one) as to the vestments. With the concession of the Eastward position and the Vestments, I believe that the main body of the Ritualists would be satisfied. Then there would be an end of all these unseemly bickerings. How can we hope that God will hear our prayers for the Church or for souls amid all this discord? Your Grace will know that I do not look for any answer to this note."

Other correspondents, however, were less reasonable, and did "look for an answer," and the Archbishop had to point out that, as a judge, intrusted with a weighty responsibility, he could neither correspond about the forthcoming judgment, nor admit the relevancy of any consideration of policy or expediency. "Our business is,"

he said, "to decide what is historically and legally true, and not what is or is not desirable."

On May 12, 1877, the Judgment was delivered, affirming the decision of the Court below, which had declared the vestments and wafer-bread to be illegal, but reversing that decision with respect to the Eastward position, which was now authorised, provided the manual acts of the officiating minister were not thereby concealed from the congregation.

The strife and recrimination which followed upon the publication of the Judgment were much less bitter than most of the prophets had foretold. Some of the Convocation debates of that summer have been already described, and when autumn came it seemed to the Archbishop that the time was ripe for an endeavour to lift the question to a higher level, and to proclaim the unity of purpose which the best men had at heart, and the essential principles which underlay the surface strife. He accordingly held at Lambeth in August and December 1877 two private conferences of clergy, inviting prominent men of every shade of opinion to meet for prayer and counsel under his direction. The endeavour found a ready response. Of those whom he invited, about 150 in all, there was only one man who declined, on principle, to attend the meetings. The proceedings were altogether private, but a list of those present was sent to the newspapers, and sufficient evidence as to the purpose and character of the meetings was afforded by the mere conjunction of such names as Canons Carter, Ryle, and Farrar; W. Boyd-Carpenter and F. H. Murray, Joseph Bardsley and H. M. Villiers, all of whom took active part in the proceedings. The earnestness of the Archbishop's opening speech at the December Conference seems to have made a deep impression. One of those

present described it as follows in a private letter to a friend :—

“ I do not know that I have ever in my life felt more deeply stirred than I was by the old Archbishop's speech. It was a speech possible only at a private gathering of this kind, and the intense earnestness which breathed in every sentence was, to me, a positive revelation as to what the man's inner life must be. He seemed at once to lift everything and everybody up to a higher level. Whether one agrees with him or not, I do not think I can ever again have the half distrust of him I used sometimes to feel. I was sitting quite near him when he spoke, and I could see the physical effort it cost him not to break down utterly, as he referred with tears in his eyes to the love and loyalty each man might rightly feel towards that form of God's many-sided truth which had first brought Christ home to his own soul. Sects may escape differences: the Catholic Church never can, but men who pray together as we are praying now will draw together in action too.”

The Archbishop's Diary has the following :—

“ ADDINGTON, *Second Sunday in Advent, Dec. 9, 1877.*—On Friday I had the second devotional meeting at Lambeth. Holy Communion in the parish church, as the chapel restoration has begun. At this meeting we had between 120 and 130. Larger and more influential, and to my mind more satisfactory than the first. The presence of Mr. Carter so soon after his published letter to Mackonochie¹ gave a reality to the hopes of union. There was plenty of plain speaking, but an admirable spirit, and, by God's blessing, I look for really good results.”

The partisan religious newspapers took, as a matter of course, a less favourable view of the attempted reconciliation. From the Evangelical side came such comment as the following, which is only worthy of notice as showing

¹ A letter in which he expressed his disapproval of Mr. Mackonochie's refusal to obey the monition of the Bishop of London's Court with respect to some of the 'ornaments' in St. Alban's Church.

the sort of spirit, upon either side, with which the Archbishop had to deal :—

“The recent meeting at Lambeth Palace has revealed to the Evangelicals in our Church a new peril, in a form so artfully enticing that we may feel thankful that it was on the spot so manfully resisted and exposed. The extreme Romanising party, led by Canon Carter and other Father Confessors, welcomed an overture so favourable to themselves, and hoped to win over the simple-minded Evangelical Protestants by the tender of a day of fasting and prayer, to heal our mutual divisions and to proclaim Unity! Unity! Unity! as the grand and only true Laodicean panacea, ‘Peace at any price.’ . . . But it was seen that after all the Evangelicals are neither so soft nor so dull as their foes imagine, and that they understand too well both their books and their practices. Before union can be established there must be a solid basis of truth. Camden reports that ‘Redwald, king of the East Saxons, the first prince of this nation who was baptized, allowed in the same church an altar for Christ and another for heathen idols.’ Here was an example of unity, but it was not the unity of one faith and of one spirit.”

Or to quote from another paper :—

“How came it to pass that after being once asked to meet law-breakers, traitors, blasphemers, and idolaters, our Ryles, Cadmans, Garbetts, Auriols, etc., should be ready to do so a second time? Do our friends believe that their attendance at the Holy Communion in such strange companionship would be an act well-pleasing to Almighty God?”

The *Guardian*, as usual, took a larger view, and in an admirable leading article described the Archbishop's effort thus :—

“. . . It was not theoretically a public meeting; we cannot, therefore, give any account of its proceedings. But a meeting consisting of more than a hundred clergy—purposely arranged so as to include representatives of all schools of thought, and held under the presidency of the Archbishop and the Bishops of London, Winchester, and Rochester—can hardly be considered as strictly a private meeting. In itself, independently of the

exact order of its proceedings, it has a public significance. There was, it is understood, no attempt made to draw up either articles of theological agreement, or concordats as to the action of individuals or of parties. The attempt would have been an absurdity and a presumption. But the object of the meeting appears to have been mainly devotional and hortatory. It invited all to join in the Holy Communion and in common prayer, having special reference to the evil and danger of division. It added to that prayer exhortations and pleadings from men of different sections in the Church—all tending in the same direction, striving to evoke sympathy and deprecate intolerance. From the nature of the case we can expect from it no definite result. But results are not unreal because they are indefinite. The remembrance of the meeting itself, and the virtual pledges which adhesion to it may be taken to have implied, must recur to many to check antagonism and to plead for charity hereafter. The significance of the very convocation of such a meeting will probably come home to many more who did not take part in it. And if there is a special promise to united prayer, we may certainly hope for a special blessing on prayer which actually unites those who are too much separated, and has for its distinct object the growth of still further unity."

The autumn of 1877 was full of interest and of work. In October, the Church Congress met, under the Archbishop's presidency, at Croydon. It was the first occasion of its meeting in the Diocese of Canterbury, and, partly on that account, partly from the nearness of Croydon to London, it soon became evident that this particular Congress would attract unusual attention. The Ecclesiastical atmosphere was stormy. Party spirit had been inflamed, almost beyond precedent, by the discussions which have been already described in connection with the Society of the Holy Cross, and a general fear was expressed that the uproarious scenes which had occasionally marred such congresses would be repeated on a larger scale at Croydon. One friend after another wrote to the Archbishop, deprecating his presence, as Primate, at such a gathering.

"I cannot but fear," wrote one Bishop, "that your Grace may inadvertently be led to lower the office you hold, if you consent to preside over these party wranglings, and so 'become a partaker in other men's sins.'"

The Archbishop, however, had no such fears, and the Congress, by universal admission, proved a conspicuous success, and set an example of harmony and order which has been happily followed ever since. According to Mr. Beresford Hope—of unrivalled congress experience—it was to the Archbishop's personal influence that the enthusiasm and success of the Congress were mainly due.

"Meeting," Mr. Hope said, "with such cyclones in the air, we might have had a dark and turbulent *latrocinium*, instead of which we have made the pleasurable discovery that the points on which we are agreed much outweigh those on which we differ. To what preponderating influence do we owe our agreement and peace? To that, I dare assert, of the most reverend Prelate who has presided over our deliberations. In his Grace's presence, I cannot say all that could be said if he were not here. I can only, therefore, state the leading fact, and I am certain that all here present will fill up the picture."

A few sentences may be appropriately quoted from the Archbishop's opening address. His words were as usual unwritten, and the address was felt by very many critics to be one of the most effective of his public utterances:—

"We do well to be tolerant, to be kindly, to be honest; for true honesty in this matter will be kindly and also tolerant. The man who is contending not for victory, but for the truth of Christ, will have a full consideration for all the difficulties which present themselves to his brother, who views the truth in a different light from himself. It is an old saying that when zealots get to heaven, if ever they get there, they will be surprised to find in that glorious company so many whom they have condemned on earth. It is when a man is waiting for death—when he feels himself in the Eternal Presence—that the truths of the Gospel of Christ appear in their true proportions; and he dwells then, not

on this or that opinion in which he differs from his fellow-men, but on those great, vital, fundamental truths of the Gospel of Christ which are the comfort and solace of the soul as it passes into eternity. If this be the spirit in which we enter upon this Congress, we shall depart from it knowing more of each other, more anxious to bear each other's burdens, to help each other in the thousand difficulties which, God knows, press upon us all. We shall not rend one another. These Christians, see how they love one another, how they help one another, how they feel for one another, how they desire in all things to be united in the Lord Jesus Christ. . . . This particular Congress has, of course, its difficulties, but it has also its helps; for I am perfectly assured that it has been a subject of much prayer; I know that throughout the kingdom, the faithful members of the Church have been instant at the Throne of Grace that this Congress may be a source of blessing to Christ's Church. I say it has its peculiar difficulties. The Church of England, like the Church of Christ throughout the world, has always had its varied phases of thought. Three of them are certainly very prominent: one class of earnest persons thinks most of the deepening of individual spiritual life; another, of fostering a reverent love for the corporate work of the body of Christ; another deals most with the intellectual problems of the age. And great names, famous in the Church of England and the Church of Christ, ennoble each school of thought—for the first, Hall; for the second, Andrewes; for the third, Butler. Men of God in each school have been ready to feel for those of the other. As long as all these schools were dead, and dulness had come upon each, and men cared little either for their own principles or for the cause of Christ, there was no difficulty in keeping the peace. When but one awoke, the others might occasionally express dissatisfaction at the disturbing of their own slumbers by the activity and vitality of that which was awake; yet still when it was only one that was awake, there was little fear of collision. When two awoke the position became difficult, and when all three awoke, then, of course, there was very great danger; men might mistake the maintenance of their own deep convictions of truth for truth itself; they might be tempted each to ignore the good in the others. Thank God we live in the days when all three are awake; thank God for it most heartily. There is no school of theologians in this country at the present moment that is not

alive and awake and anxious to do its duty according to its own convictions. Then the more necessity for our insisting, as we have done, now upon these lessons of tolerance and forbearance. One point which I will touch on is not so pleasant. It is a peculiarity of this nineteenth century, so apt to vaunt itself of the many excellencies that characterise it, that when a war breaks out the regular armies are attended by an undisciplined following of light skirmishers. Sometimes they are called *Bashi-Bazouks*—and sometimes they are called *Cossacks*—but in whichever form they exhibit themselves, the civilised nations of the world are apt to say that it is an anachronism that such people should be found in the nineteenth century. Now, I do not mean that we have an exact reproduction of such things in our theological warfare, but still it may be well to take warning. We do not wish to return to the sort of skirmishing or argument on theological subjects which was prevalent in the Dark Ages. I shall say no more on this point. The work before us is great; the prospects of this Church of ours are not dark. Some think that I never speak without an undue exaggeration of the brightness of the prospects of the Church over which I am called in God's providence to preside. But they *are* bright. Look abroad: What other country in the world would you change Churches with? Look at home: Which of the denominations would you prefer? Look back: What age are you prepared to say it would have been more satisfactory to have lived in? For my part, I thank God and take courage. . . . God knows the age has its difficulties, and those very difficulties will, I doubt not, make you more ready to unite more closely in the great work which Christ has committed to this Church of England—that grand old historical Church, happily preserved to us in its distinctive features as they have come to us from the fathers of the Reformation. It is the Church for which these men died. It is the Church of Jewel, of Hooker, of Jeremy Taylor, of Barrow, of Cudworth, of Warburton—the Church of John Keble, of Thomas Arnold, of Frederick Maurice, of Charles Simeon. The Church which was good enough for all these men is good enough for us. The Church which has been honoured by so many saints of God will, I believe, go on prospering in its Master's cause, waiting for the Lord's coming, and be found ready when He comes."

In the course of the meeting with which the Conference

closed, after its week of session, the Archbishop spoke as follows :—

“In such meetings as this many things are said which are wise. May I be excused if I venture to hint that it is possible also that some things may be said which are not wise? But whether they are wise things which are said or unwise, of this I am sure, that it is well they should be said, and that there should be a free and full expression of opinion, in order that we may, in all the difficulties which may be before us, arrive calmly and carefully at the truth. When I speak of some things being said which I do not conceive to be wise, I daresay you will think that it is not improbable I may be alluding to certain remarks which have been made as to the Bishops. An excellent friend of mine stated that he thought those now holding the office of Bishop were not the persons whom the clergy would have placed in that position if they had a free opportunity of expressing their minds. He said nothing about Archbishops. Well, I looked round the platform and saw my right rev. friend the Bishop of Winchester, and my right rev. friend the Bishop of Lichfield, and my right rev. friends the Bishops of Lincoln and Derry, and I said to myself, if my friend is right so much the worse for the clergy. But whether my right rev. friends have got to their position or no by mere accident, they are, I am sure you will admit, very respectable men, and I know they will receive, not only from this assembly, but also from their dioceses and from the Church at large that respect and regard which their high characters command. . . . My advice to you is this. In the midst of our difficulties—for, of course, there are always difficulties in every great Empire—ventilate if you will, better ways of selecting Bishops—by universal suffrage or by plebiscite : ventilate, if you will, better ways of appointing judges. I hope you will get as good a judge as Lord Hatherley. Ventilate better ways of discussing religious questions with a view to legislation—when you have produced your new plan, drawn up by somebody, and I have no clear notion of what it is to be—ventilate all these questions ; but, after all, life is short, and speculation is long, and improvements are very slow of being made, and the wisest thing that most of us who are coming to the end of our time can do is this—to make the very best of the system in which God has placed us until we find a better. . . . After all, if the Queen,

the representative of the secular power, has a good deal of influence in this Church of ours, it might be in worse hands. I have heard many schemes proposed by persons who would vest the influence now vested in the Crown in some other quarter. But discussions generally result in this—namely, a very great doubt whether any other set of men, such, for example, as the deacons of our Dissenting brethren, would upon the whole exercise a more beneficial influence on the supposed free Church of the future than Her Majesty the Queen, by God's blessing, exercises on this not free, it is said, Church of ours. Also, let this be considered, that, if we once get into the way of speaking as if the secular authorities of the land were merely secular, as if their great and only business in Parliament were to make this a rich nation—a nation in which the outward symbols of wealth were to be seen on every side—then, I fear, we might come to a very low style of statesmanship. If men, when they enter that great Assembly which represents this Empire, were to consider only the things of this life, then, I fear, the Empire would soon go to decay. It is my hope for the British Empire that every man who enters that assembly, does so with a deep impression on his mind that it is his business to do his best for his fellow-countrymen, not only as to their material prosperity, but as to what he believes to be their highest and undying interests, and to do so under a sense of the presence of Almighty God. . . . We shall I trust all of us leave this assembly strengthened for our daily work. The echoes of this great meeting will be ringing in our ears, with this warning voice, that the Church of which we are members and the Lord who presides over that Church expects each of us, in that kindly tolerant loving spirit which has characterised this meeting, to go forth and do His work among those who agree with us and those who disagree with us, and to labour quietly but incessantly to advance the kingdom of our Lord and Master."

CHAPTER XXVII.

EXTRACTS FROM DIARIES, ETC.—GENERAL WORK AND HOME LIFE.

1874-1878.

IN recording such a life as that of Archbishop Tait, the biographer has to steer a somewhat difficult course between two opposing dangers. On the one hand, a strictly chronological narrative of the successive years of an Episcopate so long and so eventful would break into disjointed and hardly intelligible scraps the history of his relation to the separate and long-standing controversies of his time ; and, on the other hand, no portraiture of the man would be of any value which failed to sketch in their due sequence the personal and family events of those busy years. Probably such a sketch may best be produced by a series of somewhat longer extracts than have hitherto been given from the Diaries—if they can be called so—in which it was his custom, each Sunday afternoon, to record in outline what had happened in the previous week. Very many of these entries are confined to the driest memoranda of his meetings, sermons, speeches, visits, interviews, and the like ; and, useful as they are for reference, the reproduction of such pages would be intolerably dull. An extract here and there will be sufficient to show the nature of this unremitting round of daily work, and the strange variety of the duties, ecclesiastical, political, educational, and social, which devolve upon a modern Archbishop even at the age of threescore and ten. The Diary, it is absolutely

certain, was written with no thought of its ever becoming public. His object, as will be explained in a later chapter, was partly to note dates for future reference—a reference scarcely ever made—and, yet more, to arrange his thoughts, whether about work, or politics, or books, or travel, or devotion, in what he called an “adhesive” shape. The devotional portions of the Diary, which, like those bearing on his domestic sorrows, are very much more numerous than can here be shown, are, of course, invariably in his own handwriting. The other entries during the years here dealt with were for the most part dictated either to Mrs. Tait or to one of his daughters. The whole is rough and unpolished to the last degree, and not a page of it was ever revised in any way. Sometimes a sentence breaks off short, or is repeated more than once, or becomes hopelessly confused, showing (what indeed is obvious throughout) the absence of any literary effort. Here and there it has been necessary to compress a long-drawn or confused paragraph, or to omit a redundant or illegible word. With these trifling and rare exceptions the extracts are printed exactly as they stand in the rough note-books, of all shapes and sizes, in which his memoranda are contained.

“ADDINGTON, *Sept.* 6, 1874.—Have preached to-day at Shirley on Acts xvii. 21. ‘Novelty and antiquity’—the old and the new in the Gospel and in our education. Sermon for Education Society. It is very interesting to me to compose these sermons. I think of them through the week, jot down a few heads and texts somewhat promiscuously, roll them well over in my mind on Friday; Saturday morning I write out fair heads of the sermon, dividing usually into four sections, one for each page of a sheet of letter paper; I ride out alone on Saturday afternoon, and find myself ready to preach when I get into the pulpit on Sunday.”

“ADDINGTON, *Sept.* 13, 1874.—During this week I have been reading carefully large portions of *Supernatural Religion*, and

find in it nothing more than a *réchauffé* of Hume's *Essay* and Middleton's *Free Enquiry*, besides an attack on Archbishop Trench, and what appears to me a really dangerous attack on Mansel's imaginations. Almost every year some book has been heralded by the sound of trumpets as if it shook all the old beliefs. It is satisfactory to find that these books have been answered long ago. . . . *Sept. 27th.*—I have read nearly all I want of *Supernatural Religion*. The author, with all his arguing, does not meet the question which I defy him to answer on his theory, namely :—How came Christianity to have assumed the very form which it did within 30 years of our Lord's death, as evidenced by the First Epistle to the Corinthians, unless that form is its real form? If it were originally only a natural religion, how did it in so short a time become entirely changed and rest every one of its doctrines on a supernatural and miraculous basis? Renan has attempted to answer this, but his so-called history is a grotesque fable. Moreover, I hold that the whole of the argument in this book against the authority of the Gospels confirms the authority of our Christianity, as, even from this author's showing, the substance of the four Gospels was known and received long before he believes them to have been written; and, therefore, must have been a part of the original teaching. In fact, to my mind, the only argument of the book is the old *petitio principii*, that miracles are impossible or incapable of proof. I think the writer is strong in his argument against Mansel, but fails in all his endeavour to shake the arguments of Mozley, and even of Trench. In fact, I do not think he can answer any one who believes that the existence and moral nature of God can be satisfactorily proved by the evidence of reason and conscience."

"*November 1st, 1874.*—Have been reading J. S. Mill's posthumous *Essays*, the one on 'Nature' especially. His account of the working of Nature is gloomy indeed. The essay seems to express belief in a benevolent super-human power, controlled by a far more potent power of evil. The object of the essay is to show that the words 'nature' and 'natural' cannot with propriety be employed as designating anything which shall make a criterion of moral right. I confess myself quite unconvinced by him, and adhere to the views of Aristotle and Butler, who plainly hold that there is a sense in which man's nature is on the side of right, and that to follow the highest nature is man's highest rule. I have been reading also Matthew Arnold's article

in the *Contemporary Review*, in defence of his *Literature and Dogma*. A marvellous piece of conceit : he patronises the Bible in the most easy and good-natured way."

"*Nov. 8th, 1874, STONEHOUSE.*—I am immersed in Mill's posthumous Essays—very strange productions—the Comtian superstructure on the foundation of his father's utilitarian Atheism. I doubt if it is quite fair to his memory to publish them. His objective religion seems to be Manicheism—a belief in an imperfect and somewhat impotent power of goodness and an almost irresistible power of evil. His essay on 'The Utility of Religion' seems to be designed to show that an objective religion is of no use ; at least, that its motives for influencing human life are but poor ones compared with those which may be gained from such an ideal religion as is suggested by Comte—what is called the Religion of Humanity. Indeed, in the earlier part of the essay he argues on what appears to me the absurd hypothesis that public opinion supplies as powerful a motive for conduct as can be wished. As if public opinion were anything more than the aggregate of the private opinions of individuals, and as if all such opinions were not based on something beyond themselves, either on religious or some other convictions. There are some fine passages in praise of the ideal religion and its freedom from all selfishness, though how such passages are to be reconciled with a strictly utilitarian system of morals I don't exactly see. Surely the idea of right as right shines out from the mists of Utilitarianism.

"I have read also a pseudo-theologico-philosophic article in the *Edinburgh* on Renan's 'Antichrist.' A very unsatisfactory article theologically, though full of interest from the quotations as to Nero's life. I am quite willing to grant that much of the imagery of the Apocalypse may be traced to the history of that gloomy time, and that the monster-Emperor may himself have suggested some of the features of Antichrist. But comparing St. Paul's two Epistles to the Thessalonians with St. John, I cannot believe that Nero was the real object in the prophetic vision. The argument for it seems to me weak, and the attempt to represent St. Paul as aimed at under the name of Baalam and the Nicolaitanes contemptible. We can thank Renan for his strong testimony to the early date and Apostolic authorship of the Revelation ; but, as in his *Life of Christ*, fancy and romance seem prevailing elements.

"To-day I have preached and administered the Holy Communion at St. Peter's. Thank God for the strength He has left me and for all our happiness!"

"ADDINGTON, *12th December* 1874.—Lightfoot and the Bishop of Manchester staying with us. Much talk with both on the state of the Church. Letters from Lord Shaftesbury and the Archbishop of York, taking very different lines, illustrate the difficulties of the elements which I have to try to blend.

"On Thursday at Lambeth, an interview with Colenso. He was with me for about an hour, and stated his views of the way in which the natives near the Natal Colony have been treated by the colonists, and his thankfulness at having convinced Lord Carnarvon that the natives had been shamefully used. He pointed out incidentally how the line he had taken in this matter must separate him from all his present friends among the colonists. I then laid before him my exact view of his legal position, pointing out how I still adhered to my conviction that the Bishop of Capetown's Judgment was null and void in law, having been declared to be so by the Court of Appeal; but that Lord Romilly's Judgment had pointed out how any one who pleased might have had his case tried on the merits. I set before him that this view had nothing to do with the plain right of every pastor of a parish or Bishop of a diocese to exclude him from the pulpit on the ground of the dangerous nature of his opinions. I said that I should not be honest if I did not tell him very explicitly my opinion of the position in which he stood: That a great conflict was raging between Infidelity and Christianity; Infidelity assuming at one time the form of a sentimental Deism and at another a blank Atheism; and that he was generally regarded and quoted as being on the Infidel and not the Christian side; that he was bound in virtue of his position to show that he was a Christian; that all controversies within the Church or respecting the maintenance of the outward institutions of the Church were as nothing compared with this contest between Christianity and Infidelity. He protested that he was engaged in continually preaching Christian truth. He held indeed that it was the Christian life, rather than the formal assertion of Christian doctrine, that he was bound to preach, and used words somewhat similar to what F. Maurice would have employed. I said, however, that Maurice meant by such words a great deal more than the necessity of inculcating Christian morality; that,

in fact, the turning point was this: Did a man believe and preach the Resurrection of Jesus Christ? I held with St. Paul that, without a belief in Christ's Resurrection, our preaching and faith are vain. He said that while St. Paul held himself to the literal doctrine of the Resurrection, he did not deny that those who disbelieved it were Christians. He said that not the fact as commonly stated, but the doctrine underlying it, was important: that the doctrine, for example, of Christ sitting at the right hand of God could not be understood in a literal sense. He urged that he believed fully the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. I reminded him that even that was denied by many persons who were disposed to claim him as on their side, and I urged him to shake himself free from all complicity with such attacks on Christianity. He said (in the course of our conversation) that he had been so much occupied with the Old Testament that he had no time to turn himself to criticism of the New Testament. He seemed shocked when I set before him my view of the real controversy of the day, and professed that, having been much occupied with practical matters respecting the Colony, he had had no time to make himself acquainted with such books as Mill's *Life* and posthumous *Essays*, or *Supernatural Religion*, or Matt Arnold's articles. I cannot help hoping that what I said as seriously as I could at the close of our meeting may have had some effect on him. As to South African Church matters, he fully allowed that the general withdrawal of Letters Patent had altered his position in reference to the South African Church. He had been courteously received by Bishop Jones at the Cape, and expressed his desire to act harmoniously with him, though he insisted strongly that the so-called South African Church could not be regarded as identical with the Church of England in Africa. He said that all the evils of a schism, such as were anticipated by those who opposed Bishop Macrorie's consecration, had actually arisen; and that in the event of his [Colenso's] withdrawal, there was no prospect of the members of the Church of England in Natal placing themselves under Bishop Macrorie."

"ADDINGTON, *December 27th*.—On Wednesday I was four hours with a deputation of High Church clergy on the subject of the present state of affairs in the Church. The meeting was on the whole satisfactory, and I have no doubt, when it was over, we better understood each other's ground. They were

good, earnest, intelligent, and on the whole moderate men—13 in number, the most extreme being —. Bright and Furse both spoke moderately, all agreeing in reprobating the violent and irreligious tone of the High Church papers. The fault in what they urged was the inconsistency of professing to desire that there should be no change in the Rubrics, and yet obviously wishing that something should be done by Convocation to interpret the Rubrics in their sense. This was specially urged by Canon Ashwell, and I endeavoured to point out the inconsistency."

"*3rd January, 1875.*—On Thursday a long interview with the Dean of St. Paul's and Canon Liddon, who came to me on the same subject as the deputation of last week. The same difficulties occurred, but on the whole I think the conversation was satisfactory and made us better understand each other.

"I have finished the Prince Consort's Life, vol. i., and am deep in the third volume of Greville's *Memoirs*. What a contrast between the biographies: the first elevates, the second lowers. The only thing that disappoints me in the first are the very prosy letters of Stockmar, and the fussy sort of way in which he was always giving abstract lectures on virtue and honour to the Prince. Everything from the Queen in the book breathes perfect nature, and it is impossible not to admire and even reverence the Prince for the part he took in his difficult circumstances."

"*Ash Wednesday, 10th Feb. 1875, ADDINGTON.*—This day has of old been a solemn day to me. Twenty-eight years have passed since the doctor came to my bedside at Rugby and told me how I must expect to die. Lord, great have been Thy mercies during these eight-and-twenty years. How many of my coevals gone! how great my trials, privileges, opportunities! Lord, grant me now to be waiting ready, leaning on Thee, washed in the blood of Christ. To-day I have addressed the people in our Chapel and in Addington Church. I have also visited several of our villagers, and have had some quiet time for thought and prayer. Bless, O Lord, the day and all this Lent to my soul."

"*ADDINGTON, Feb. 21, 1875, Second Sunday in Lent.*—This day my beloved son was ordained Priest by me. When I found myself actually laying my hands upon him I could hardly proceed with the service. He has been a blessing to us now for many years, and I trust a happy and useful career is in store for

him by God's blessing. . . . I am sure the dear companions of his childhood, his sweet sisters in Heaven, must have rejoiced with us to-day."

"*LAMBETH, May 2nd, Fifth Sunday after Easter.*—A busy week. Tuesday, I spoke for the Bishop of London's Fund; Wednesday, for S. P. G. Thursday, we had 42 people to dinner. Yesterday, consecrated Samuel Thornton in Westminster Abbey to be Bishop of Ballarat. In the evening dined at the Royal Academy and made a speech. I had written it on Monday as the week was full of work, and I took time by the forelock. This is the only speech of the year which I write: the circumstances are peculiar. These things, with the ordinary pressure of correspondence and interviews and Ecclesiastical Commission and House of Lords, have pretty well filled up the week, and I have not been able to read much.

"*Sunday, May 9th, 1875, LAMBETH.*—On Tuesday very busy with interviews all day. On Wednesday spoke at the Bible Society meeting, and heard Mr. Spurgeon and Dr. Punshon. Ascension Day, preached at Lambeth and administered the Holy Communion; very tired. Friday, interviews, with business, all day long till I went to the House of Lords, and was there for hours, hearing the debate upon military changes; excellent speech by Cardwell. Saturday, British Museum from 12 till 4. Got ready my sermon. To-day, preached at St. Peter's, Notting Hill, and administered the Holy Communion. Very large congregation. Thank God for a happy and useful week."

"*LAMBETH, June 20th, 1875.*—On Tuesday I waited on the Sultan of Zanzibar, who received me attended by his Arab chiefs. I cannot say much for his personal appearance. Of his conversation we could only judge by Dr. Badger's flowing constructions. Have to-day preached on Queen's Accession at St. John's, Waterloo Road. Have read this week Gladstone's article on the Prince Consort, and Orby Shipley's foolish production on the New Court—both in the *Contemporary*; an answer by Scott to my *Fallacies of Unbelief*, some of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, and a novel."

"*ADDINGTON, 8th August, 1875.*—The great Bishop Thirlwall is dead. There are only three Bishops now living who were on the Bench when I was appointed to London—Llandaff, London, and Durham. On Tuesday Craufurd and I attended Thirlwall's

funeral in Westminster Abbey. It was a solemn and grand sight. Six Bishops carried the pall. The Dean's voice was to be heard all through the Abbey, and I shall never forget the anthem as sung by the choristers by the open grave. 'His body is buried in peace, but his name liveth for evermore.' A scanty attendance of his old literary and Cambridge friends, but I believe most of them are dead. Curious that we should have had such correspondence so recently."

A special interest attaches to the letters here alluded to, written as they were, within a few days of Bishop Thirlwall's death. To the *Contemporary Review* of July 1875, Mr. Gladstone had contributed a powerful article entitled "Is the Church of England worth preserving?" The conclusions at which the writer arrived were summarised by him under five heads, and their significance will be apparent from the correspondence.

Bishop Thirlwall to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"59 PULTENEY STREET, BATH,

July 12, 1875.

"MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,—My inability to take any part in the present movement in the Church does not at all abate the interest I feel in it. And this must be my excuse for troubling you with a question with regard to a point on which I feel great doubt.

"I have had Mr. Gladstone's article, in the last *Contemporary Review*, read to me *twice*; but I am still not sure that I understand its precise scope and import. When I first heard it my impression was one of extreme surprise. Notwithstanding my strong habitual prepossessions in favour of the writer, it appeared to me strangely sophistical, and, in a very special sense of the word, Jesuitical. For the principle laid down by Mr. Gladstone seemed to me identical with that which Pascal, whether rightly or wrongly, ascribes to the Jesuits: according to which every breach of morality may be covered by a certain direction of the intention.

"I had imagined that there was at least one plain and safe rule, with regard to ritual observances, namely, that no clergyman should be allowed so to conduct the Communion Service as to make it a vehicle for the expression of doctrine as to which his congregation might take an entirely different view. But, if I understand Mr. Gladstone, he entirely rejects and condemns every such restriction imposed upon a clergyman; and this mainly upon what appears to me the strange ground, that persons of entirely different views are now found to agree in the act of kneeling at the Reception of the Holy Communion. I am quite unable to perceive the relevancy of this illustration of his meaning. And to me it appeared an extravagant paradox, that no importance whatever was to be attached to the Clergyman's own declaration of his intentions. I remember that some years ago, when I attended the service at St. Alban's, Holborn, in company with Sir Robert Phillimore and Bishop Wilberforce, there were not only the lights, the vestments, and incense, which, by a favourable construction of the intention, might be considered as equivocal and inoffensive, but besides the Eastward position there was the elevation of the consecrated elements, and genuflexions made to come very near to prostration, and there were also hymns, sung by the Choir during the service, which I more than suspect to have contained very explicit declarations of doctrine. But it would seem, according to Mr. Gladstone, that none of these things went beyond the bounds within which the Clergyman's liberty should be confined. I must, however, say that on the second hearing of the article my opinion of it was a little modified; as it appeared that there were a few words from which it might be collected that there was some line by which he thought that the Clergyman's liberty might be rightly restrained, though how or where this was to be drawn did not to me clearly appear.

"I have since heard read the report of your speech in Convocation both in the *Times* and the *Guardian*; and the former looked for once as if it were the more full and accurate. In it I thought I saw a reference to Mr. Gladstone's article; and, if so, the view you expressed of it seemed to come very near to my own. But I should be glad to hear from yourself whether, and how far, this was the case, and whether you find in the article the enunciation of any principle which could be usefully applied to the settlement of existing disputes. . . .

"Pray excuse the trouble I am giving you, though it will not require you to answer me at equal length.—I am, my dear Archbishop, yours very faithfully,

"CONNOP THIRLWALL (Bishop).

"*P.S.*—You are doubtless aware that I have lost the use of my right hand, and almost entirely my eyesight—quite, as far as regards reading—and am, therefore, obliged to avail myself of another's hand to write to you."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Bishop Thirlwall.

"STONEHOUSE, ST. PETER'S, THANET,
20th July 1875.

"MY DEAR BISHOP,—Pray forgive me for leaving your letter for some days unanswered. I did not like to answer it till I could read over for the second time Mr. Gladstone's article to which it refers, and the pressure of business made it impossible for me to command time for the reperusal till I came down here yesterday for a day's rest.

"I feel, on reading the article, the same sort of bewilderment which very often comes over me in reading the productions of the distinguished author. Many of the premisses in the argument appear to me to be perfectly true, and from these true principles I do not know that any conclusion which I regard as false is declaredly deduced; but I cannot help feeling that there is some implied conclusion floating in the mind of the writer, and intended to be adopted by the reader, which, I hold, does not follow legitimately from the premisses, and which certainly appears to me to be in itself false. What I mean will be apparent in a moment. The five avowed conclusions at the end of the article¹ seem to be all sound, except the second, which I should

"These 'conclusions' were as follows:—

"I. The Church of this great nation is worth preserving; and for that end much may well be borne.

"II. In the existing state of minds, and of circumstances, preserved it cannot be, if we shift its balance of doctrinal expression, be it by an alteration of the Prayer Book (either way) in contested points, or be it by treating rubrical interpretations of the matters heretofore most sharply contested on the basis of 'doctrinal significance.'

"III. The more we trust to moral forces, and the less to penal proceed-

willingly allow to be sound also were it not that it contains certain expressions which I do not fully understand, and which seem to me to insinuate something which is different from the conclusion legitimately deducible from any sound principles found in the article.

"The second of the five conclusions is this: 'In the existing state of minds and of circumstances, it (the Church of England) cannot be (preserved) if we shift its balance of doctrinal expression.' So far, well—if the meaning be that there would be great danger to the establishment if we undertook a work similar to that which many suppose has been tried in Ireland, and if we set about at this time an expurgation of the Prayer-Book with the view of eliminating either its Catholic or its Protestant elements. I am willing also to go further with this conclusion, when it goes on to assert that this shifting of the balance must not be brought about by an alteration of the Prayer-Book either way, if the writer means that any departure from the forms of the Prayer-Book by a revision of it may be perilous, and would under existing circumstances be unjustifiable, if it in any way interfered with the liberty which has hitherto been enjoyed in the Church. But I suspect the author means more than this: I think he means to insinuate that not only the liberty fairly claimed, and pronounced by the Courts of the Church to be legitimate, is not to be disturbed, but that also any interpretation which has introduced of late years wholly unauthorised and hitherto unheard-of interpretations of this liberty is not to be interfered with. True, that up to this point he is only speaking in condemnation of alterations of the formularies by enactment, which he is quite justified in considering to be perilous, even if they are confined to making clear any ambiguous expressions which the advocates of unheard-of novelties have lately fastened

ings (which are to a considerable extent exclusive one of the other), the better for the Establishment, and even for the Church.

IV. "If litigation is to be continued, and to remain within the bounds of safety, it is highly requisite that it should be confined to the repression of such proceedings as really imply unfaithfulness to the national religion.

V. "In order that judicial decisions on ceremonial may habitually enjoy the large measure of authority, finality, and respect which attaches in general to the sentences of our Courts, it is requisite that they should have uniform regard to the rules and results of full historical investigation, and should, if possible, allow to stand over for the future matters insufficiently cleared, rather than decide them upon partial and fragmentary evidence."

on and represented as favouring their own peculiar opinions. He is quite entitled to hold, and I am disposed on the whole to agree with him, that it might be dangerous at present to alter, for example, the words of the Ornaments Rubric—ambiguous and misleading as they be—and I prefer that we should leave it to the Law Courts to interpret the ambiguous words; but I cannot divest myself of the conviction that the author means something different from this. I am fortified in this suspicion when I find him going on to deprecate what he somewhat unintelligibly calls ‘treating rubrical interpretations of the matters heretofore most sharply contested on the basis of doctrinal significance.’ This is given as an alternative mode of ‘shifting the balance of doctrinal expression,’ and is contrasted with altering the Prayer-Book. Therefore, I presume, it means procuring a decision from the Courts which shall declare the practices complained of illegal, and which shall thus indirectly affect the doctrines which their advocates maintain that they symbolise.

“This seems to me to be the probable meaning of the author. He argues, I think, throughout the article that the outward acts of worship in question are insignificant in themselves—hence he holds that you have no right to treat them as important, even when those who uphold them tell you explicitly that they only value them because they believe them to be the best and readiest mode of teaching what you hold to be false doctrine, viz., what the Protestant Church of England has always repudiated under the name of the falsely called ‘Catholic’ doctrine of the Mass, as opposed to the true Catholic doctrine of the Holy Communion. I cannot understand the close of this second of the five conclusions in any other sense than as insinuating that the matters ‘most sharply contested’ ought not to be decided in a sense adverse to the parties over whom the author wishes to throw the shield of his protection.

“It appears to me to be childish to be harping on the undoubted fact that the practices in question would in themselves have no doctrinal significance if it were not that a doctrinal significance is attributed to them. We all know this, and we might have passed them over as unimportant had it not been that their advocates prevent us from doing so by urging their deep doctrinal importance as teaching the doctrine of the Mass. Hence we desire to have an authoritative decision as to whether they are lawful or not, and if it should so chance that

the particular practices in question are, contrary to all expectation, declared to be lawful, we shall then acquiesce in them, disclaiming the doctrinal conclusions which our opponents affix to them. But we cannot, as the author of the article wishes, admit them in the first instance without question because in themselves they may by protest be separated from the meaning which their supporters attach to them.

"To take my illustration of the white flag in France : if I were a Frenchman I should resist its introduction because I know what the Legitimists mean by it ; but if it were adopted, I should then declare that I repudiated the meaning put on it by the Legitimists, and was prepared to uphold the liberties usually regarded as represented by the opposite symbol of the tricolour. I fear I shall tire you by all this. . . .

"The Lord give us a happy deliverance from these foolish and unworthy disputes ; but I don't think anything will be gained by underrating their importance. I greatly rejoice to have heard from you, and to find that you take so lively an interest in what is going on. May God long preserve you to help us with your advice. I hope to return to Lambeth to-morrow. Mrs. Tait joins in every good wish.—Ever sincerely yours, my dear Lord,
A. C. CANTUAR."

"*P.S.*—When I say that I assent to the rest of the five conclusions, except the second, I ought perhaps to say that I consider the fifth to be sophistical, when we compare it with certain statements in the body of the article, though harmless enough in itself. I suspect that it is intended to imply that the subjects at present in dispute are incapable of solution by a judicial sentence."

Bishop Thirlwall to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"59 PULTENEY STREET, BATH,
July 22, 1875.

"MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,—I should hardly have ventured to have written to you, if I could have foreseen that I should be drawing so largely on your scanty leisure ; but I am the more obliged to you for so fully answering my question, and rejoice to find my opinion so far confirmed by your authority.—I am, my dear Archbishop, yours sincerely,

"CONNOP THIRLWALL (Bishop)."

This letter the Archbishop received on July 24th. Three days later came the news of Bishop Thirlwall's death.

Diary.

"PARIS, *August 15th*, 1875.—Last Monday, in the House of Lords, the interesting subject of the French service in Canterbury Cathedral. I hope that what I said and the letter I afterwards wrote to the Charity Commissioners may stop their meddling plan, or rather may cause the service to be preserved in a more decorous form, while the charity money is better bestowed. Paris is wonderful; brighter than I ever saw it. How many years it is—about 40—since Oakeley and I were first here. God has watched over us through a thousand public and private changes."

"MÜRREN, *August 29th*, 1875.—This place would be perfect, perched as it is near the eternal snows, with sounds of falling avalanches, looking straight upon savage rocks and glaciers with Eiger, Mönch, and Jungfrau rising above them to catch the first light of the rising moon; also with the softest grass and verdure and innumerable chalets—were it not that really too many people come to enjoy it. 130 guests in this not large house, and eternal piano and singing. I have finished with great interest the *Plebiscite* of Erckmann-Chatrian, and have learned from it fully to enter into the French feeling as to the German war. But as the writer's object is plainly to recommend a Republic, I think he has acted neither fairly nor wisely by not saying a word about the horrors of the Commune, which, as a wise Republican, he was bound to account for, or rather excuse."

"ADDINGTON, *12th Sept.* 1875.—Last Tuesday, in the hotel at Ouchy, I saw in the list of the company, in large characters, 'M. Thiers.' I sent to him my card with a polite message, and he at once cordially received me. The old man was evidently much pleased and chatted pleasantly. The only English ecclesiastic he seemed ever to have known was Bishop Wilberforce. 'En Angleterre on s'occupe beaucoup des questions religieuses : en France on ne se mêle pas beaucoup de ces choses.' He had not read Gladstone's *Vaticanism*.

"From an outside view of France, from the railway, looking at all the little village churches past which we hurry, one gathers the impression that Romanism must be alive in its work all

through the country. The effect produced is much the same as that produced in hurrying by rail through England and seeing the restored churches and school-houses. Without any certain means of judging, you gather from a bird's-eye view that there is life."

"RUGBY, *Sunday, October 10th, 1875.*—Preached and administered Holy Communion here. We left this house 25 years ago, when Craufurd was not a year old. Not a single master remains of our time except Charles Arnold. It is strange and striking year by year to take up portions of our past life as we do, and it is a great blessing that we have never been alienated from the scenes of our former work or from those who have succeeded us."

"ADDINGTON, *December 26th, 1875.*—Have been reading *Life of Bishop Gray of Capetown*. It quite confirms my view of his character: thoroughly earnest and conscientious, but self-willed and imperious; placed in circumstances of exceeding difficulty, principally from the opinions he had adopted as to the spiritual power vested in him as a Bishop. It is pleasing to read the letters to his son on other matters, and the good advice he sends. Sad that so much of his time was necessarily occupied by the disputes which were somehow forced upon him. His affection for the Bishop of Oxford is very touching, but he does not spare even him when thinking that he does not stand with sufficient manliness to the extreme opinions he had adopted. On the whole I cannot say that the *Life* is a very successful biography. It is far too one-sided, even for the work of a son. It never seems to occur to the biographer, or indeed, to the Bishop himself, during all the stormy years which he passed battling with opposition, that the many persons of all kinds who could not agree in the wisdom or justice of his course of action in any point might by possibility be right, and that they had some real ground to fear lest he was urging them to dangerous courses in his horror of the evils with which he had to contend. Indeed, the book recalls very vividly that feeling of restlessness and almost recklessness which oppressed those who had to deal with him, and which made Archbishop Longley almost tremble with anxiety at the arrival of each mail from the Cape. The last volume indeed describes a feverish life of constant antagonism not pleasant to contemplate, though relieved by gleams of tenderness in his letters to his friends, and

even once or twice in his dealings with Colenso. The biographer certainly, when he can, adds bitterness in his treatment of the subject, and the length and fulness with which he dwells on the danger of unsound doctrine contrasts most painfully with his total silence on dangers of another kind, which, quite as much as the Colenso difficulty in Natal, threatened to extinguish the work of the Church in the Orange River State."

"LAMBETH, *Sunday, March 5th*, 1876.—On Thursday I introduced in the Lords my Offices and Fees Bill in a speech of nearly an hour. Friday, full of business till 4 o'clock, when we went to Windsor. Read some of Dr. Guthrie's *Life*. Dined with the Queen, and stayed all night. Early in the day I had seen the Dean of Westminster in his desolate home, and ended my visit by a prayer with him. No one can tell what a loss Lady Augusta is. . . . Next morning to St. George's Chapel and saw the marvellous work of the Wolsey Chapel, which is now completed. Yesterday afternoon was taken up with sermon, and reading all the speeches on the Burials debate. I do trust this very awkward question may now be arranged. To-day I have preached to an enormous congregation in the new Parish Church of Kensington and administered Holy Communion. Very tired. Have tried in vain to read Hort's *Dissertation*, or Wace's *Lectures*, or Huxley's *Lay Sermons*. I could make no way with any. This is the 20th anniversary of our sweet Chatty's last day on earth.

"LAMBETH, *Sunday, March 12th*, 1876.—On March 12th, 1856, we laid our darling Susan in the same grave with Chatty, in a storm of sleet and rain, just as it is to-day. Twenty years have passed since that day. Thursday was the day of Lady Augusta Stanley's funeral—the most strange and touching gathering that has probably ever been assembled in the Abbey. The pall-bearers were the Duke of Westminster, who had seen a good deal of her in her last illness, and had taken part with her in the scheme of Nurses for Westminster; Shaftesbury, who had presided every year at her Flower-show for the poor; Campbell-Bannerman, M.P. for Dumfermline Burghs; Browning, who took the place of Tennyson; myself; Dr. Caird, representing the Church of Scotland, and Dr. Stoughton, representing the Nonconformists; all the Dean's Rugby and most of his Oxford friends; old Carlyle, and Houghton and Gladstone; every shade of Christians and a good many whose Christianity was doubtful—certainly a wonderful

testimony to the extended influence of the Dean and Lady Augusta in every sphere. There were the Queen and the three Princesses, and Prince Christian, and representatives of all the Royal branches, and a crowd of the poor of Westminster. As Plumptre said to-day, it was strange to think what must have been the various thoughts of those many people as they stood in the presence of the one fact which none of them would deny or explain. The dear lady will leave a great blank. She sent a message to Catharine and me from her death-bed."

"LAMBETH, *Sunday, 2d April, 1876.*—We are drawing to the close of our winter campaign in London. Have preached to-day for the London Nurses for the Sick Poor, in St. Michael's, Chester Square, which recalled our first months in London in November 1856. A very large congregation. This week has been as usual too busy. Monday, Wednesday, Friday, Committee on the Fee Bill from twelve onwards. On Friday I was in the House of Lords from 12 o'clock to 11.30 P.M., with the exception of half-an-hour's interval for a ride. The Fee Bill Committee was followed by the University Debate, to which I had to give undivided attention. I spoke chiefly on the subject of poor students, and was disappointed to find my speech condensed. This has led me to reproduce it—not an easy matter. On Thursday also we had a long night in the House of Lords, on the Queen's title of Empress, on which England seems to have gone rather mad."

"LAMBETH, *Sunday, April 30th, 1876.*—It appears an age since last Sunday. We broke up at Addington on Monday, and went to Oxford to be the guests of Lord and Lady Beauchamp, for the opening of Keble College. Tuesday was a day greatly to be remembered. Full accounts of it in the newspapers. We went to Church at 7.30 A.M., and the service for the opening of the Chapel was not over till 7.30 P.M. For myself, I did not hear one single sentence of Dr. Pusey's sermon, or even the text. I administered the Holy Communion myself in the morning. The Bishop of Oxford was present and gave the blessing. There was a gloom over the proceedings from Lord Lyttelton's death, but it was wonderful how well everything was arranged. In the evening went to a great gathering at the Vice-Chancellor's in New College Hall, where I saw almost every one I knew in Oxford. Spent Wednesday morning visiting old friends, and seeing buildings

erected or restored since we were last there. By seven o'clock we were re-established at Lambeth. Thursday, full of business, and a great meeting of S.P.G. in Willis's Rooms, at which I took the Chair, and had the rather difficult task of introducing Bishop Macrorie without compromising myself or unsaying anything I had said before. His old connection with the East of London supplied me with kindly things to say, and the introduction of the voluntary system into South Africa cleared the way to get rid of controversy in a country wide enough for all the Bishops and all the Churches which desire to advance the Kingdom of Christ there. Friday, full of ordinary business. Saturday, British Museum; Royal Academy Dinner—speeches not so good as usual, Froude good and fluent."

"*Whit Sunday, June 5, 1876.*—I have been reading the *Life of Norman Macleod* and *Felix Holt*, and to-day Gladstone's article in the *Contemporary* on the 'Courses of Religious Thought.' I find nothing to blame in it, though perhaps he scarcely realises that the third of his 'Schools,' free from certain exaggerations in his picture of it, is the Christian school of the Apostolic days."

"*July 9, 1876.*—I have been preaching extempore sermons at Margate, Canterbury, Dartford, etc., during the last five weeks. I have simply chosen my text, thought it out carefully, read Wordsworth, Alford, etc., used the Concordance, and written down a very few notes. I cannot help thinking that I have preached with more freedom and acceptance than I ever did before. Perhaps the thoughts were not so good, certainly they were not so well condensed, but they are fresher and seem more to reach the people's hearts. It is a glorious employment, this preaching of the everlasting Gospel, and good for one's own soul at least, whether it reaches others or no. But I want a life of greater, deeper, truer prayer."

"*August 13, 1876.*—Tuesday, to House of Lords for the Education Debate, having secured by telegram that I should speak third. I spoke about 40 minutes and was satisfied. Granville and Ripon spoke well. The reports of the House of Commons told of a cabal to displace the Bishops in the Final Court of Appeal, a scheme which in my judgment would prove fatal to the Established Church. On Wednesday I had to work hard to frustrate the infamous attempt, but we triumphed by a sufficient majority. On Thursday was obliged to hurry to London

and remain late in the House of Lords for the purpose of delivering two sentences on the Cowper-Temple Clause in the Education Debate. Did not reach home till 10, so that it took 7 hours to speak for five minutes. But the time was well spent, as those five minutes secured a declaration from the Ministry, uncontradicted by the Opposition, that the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and Ten Commandments may be taught in Board Schools. . . .

"I have been touched by Disraeli's departure from the House of Commons to enter upon his earldom. This and Delane's illness, marking that he cannot much longer rule the *Times*, seem to announce that a new hour is about to strike, and old actors on the stage to disappear. The troubled East is full of uneasy movements. God only knows what is in store.

"To-day I have been reading with deepest interest, in the Dean of Westminster's new volume of the Jewish Church, the marvellous account of Old Babylon. Of it not one stone is left upon another. How little is man; how vain man's merely material works compared with his influence on the minds that are to follow!

"Yesterday I had a telegram from the Metropolitan of Servia on the atrocities. This must be instantly attended to."

"*5th November* 1876, STONEHOUSE.—On Thursday I was in London to attend the Privy Council, and passed the night at Fulham. We had a full gathering of the Privy Council, with the three Prelates, Judges, etc. After careful discussion we settled the question of the Assessors, and yesterday I was able to write my answer to a letter from Dr. Pusey on the question. God grant that all these questions of strife may pass! May He give us a sound mind!"

"*Advent Sunday, December 3, 1876.*—Read carefully to-day Mozley's Sermon on the Atonement. A noble production, especially in the latter part, where it amplifies Butler's theory that all Nature is full of mediation, and applies it to the old legends as all chiming in with the one grand chorus which proclaims the reasonableness of the doctrine. I still feel however that there is something strained and unnatural in that part of the sermon which endeavours to explain the effect of sacrifice on the attribute of justice in the mind of the Being appeased. It would have been, I think, much better to leave this untouched as part of the

ineffable mystery ; while this might have been more dwelt on, that the knowledge of Another's sacrifice for our sin does so affect the sinner who accepts it that he is a changed being, and therefore a fit object for change of feeling towards him in the Holy God Whom he has offended, but with Whom he is now reconciled through his knowledge and acceptance of the Sacrifice."

"11th February 1877, *Quinquagesima*.—Attended this week the opening of Parliament, the Queen being present and wearing for the first time, some one says, her crown as Empress of India. Lord Beaconsfield was on her left side, holding aloft the sword of state. At 5 the House again was crammed to see him take his seat ; and Slingsby Bethell, equal to the occasion, read aloud the writ in very distinct tones. All seemed to be founded on the model, 'What shall be done to the man whom the King delighteth to honour?' There was an animated debate on Eastern affairs, in which Lord B., acting as Leader of the House, made a short speech in his best manner, in answer to the Duke of Argyll.

"All Friday was taken up with another long meeting of the Bishops. Great discussion in reference to a Lambeth Conference, the decision as to which we were obliged still to postpone. I moved in the Lords for the Intemperance Committee.

"Saturday—Grillion's breakfast—Duke of Argyll—Lord Salisbury's Constantinopolitan experiences—afterwards to Charterhouse with Selborne, with whom I had much talk on Church matters—back to Lambeth in time to finish my memorandum on the Ridsdale Appeal, and sent it to the Privy Council—back to Addington by 5.30, very tired.

"During the week have read much of *The Ring and the Book*—wonderful power of description—to-day another of Mozley's lectures, on Jael—surely the sophistical element is strongly developed."

"*Good Friday*, 1877.—I have been reading, partly out of doors and partly in my library, Chattie's [Lady Wake's] record of our last years at Carlisle and first in London. It is touching and full of wholesome thought thus to go back on the melancholy yet blessed and most eventful past. O Lord, how wonderfully hast Thou dealt with me in past years ! I trust I am not settled on my lees—Lord, keep me ever fresh in Thy service. What a whirl was I plunged in when I went to London ! Keep me from the petty cares of party warfare. Darken not my last years with these

frivolous and bitter disputes which rend the Church. They have ever been endeavouring to mar spiritual life during the twenty years of my episcopate. Lord, keep my faith and zeal fresh. Watch over us one by one and over the Church and nation."

"*Whit Tuesday, 22d May.*—After a fortnight's uncertainty a telegram arrived to-day to say that dear John [the Archbishop's eldest brother] entered into his rest at Edinburgh this morning. His was no common character, and his life had very great trials. Till 21 he was heir to wealth. Then it all disappeared, after he was engaged to be married. His married life in comparative poverty was supremely happy. How well I remember the joy at his appointment to his first Sheriffship! Then trials came in the loss of four children; but still he was very happy with the best and most lovable of wives. Then she was taken away and all was dark. Then other trials. Then wealth came back abundantly, and then health failed. But all through, in wealth and in poverty, in brightness and in cloud, in health and strength, and in utter weakness, he was blessed with a happy well-balanced mind. He lived and died beloved and honoured. I hope to see him laid by his dear Mary's side."

"*EDINBURGH, 2d June 1877.*—Reached this place last Monday night. On Tuesday morning we all met in dear John's room and had prayer together. At 11, Craufurd read the first part of the English service over the coffin, the family and servants being present. Soon afterwards, when the general company assembled, Dr. Norman Macleod read some passages of Scripture and offered up prayer. Then by train to Stirling. There met many friends from the country, and each large house and village along the valley supplied some additional friend, till we reached the well-known spot between the Devon and the Harvieston woods. The day was bright, with sudden gusts and showers; the lights and shades upon the mountains lent them their peculiar charm, and the woods, just bursting out in variety of tints. The well-known and loved spots put forth all their charms as he, who so loved them all, was borne to his long-chosen resting place. It was a solemn but not a sorrowful day as we laid him to rest after his long weary trial. By seven o'clock we were back in Edinburgh."

"... On Friday I visited the General Assembly—I suppose the first Archbishop who ever was present at its debates. Ominously enough, soon after I entered, Balfour of Burleigh rose, but it was only to continue a speech on Education."

"*July 30th, FULHAM PALACE.*—Came here on Friday to stay till Monday. Great interest, as ever, in revisiting our old home. Preached this morning for the first time in the old Parish Church since I left this in 1869. Felt deeply, in preaching, the solemnity of the occasion. Text: 'Blessed are they who have not seen and yet have believed.' Bishop of Winchester and party here on Friday; Dean of Westminster, Sir James Paget, etc. The dear Bishop here calm and true as ever in these troublous times. The Lord give us all such a calm and honest spirit!

"Thursday and Friday we had discussions on theological matters in the House of Lords. I had to answer Lord Nelson as to what he called the working man's petition for the repeal of the P.W.R. Act, and I hope spoke temperately and kindly, though firmly. — very abusive of me; not worth answering.

"Wednesday was the Consecration of Thorold in the Abbey. A great gathering of Evangelical clergy. An able sermon by Sir E. Bayley: too controversial in the beginning, but excellent in its calm testimony to Thorold's excellence, and its vindication of Evangelical doctrine."

"ADDINGTON, *Sunday, Oct. 14th, 1877.*—I desire to record my thankfulness for the way in which the Church Congress at Croydon has passed.¹ It has shown the Church of England far more at one than any expected; it has shown violent people to be nowhere. The speeches and papers have generally been temperate. Foolish things have here and there been said about the State and the Burials Bill, but as a rule there has been a wise, tolerant spirit as to differences both within and without the Church. I have heard three grand sermons—Lightfoot's and Farrar's eminently so."

"STONEHOUSE, *Nov. 4th, 1877.*—I have read most of Wallace's *Russia* in the garden and beside the sea. The account of ten millions of Russian sectaries quite astonished me—an eighth part of the whole population. Each day the girls, Davidson, and I have been getting up the 'latitudinarian divines' from Macaulay and Perry. To-day I have read the greater part of Bishop Feild's *Life*."

"ADDINGTON, *Feb. 10, 1878.*—Last Sunday evening took part in the service for the induction of our dear Craufurd at St. John's, Notting Hill. God grant him health and strength to enter upon his work after Easter!

¹ See pp. 295-300.

"This week has been a perpetual rush. Monday, in Folkestone. Tuesday, preached at the opening of Headcorn Church; then to Pluckley, where a huge party of clergy and others. Next morning off to Tonbridge Wells to educational meeting; at Mr. Hoare's for night. Off next morning early for the Ecclesiastical Commission. Great deputation at Lambeth on the Burials Bill. Exciting hour at the House of Lords. Then down here, with a house full of Bishops. Off next morning to the Bishops' meeting, which lasted till 5. House of Lords still more exciting: Russian terms of armistice announced. Down here again with Bishops. Nothing known as to the state of things in Constantinople."

It was with a heavy heart that the Archbishop went through the work of those spring months. His son Craufurd had returned in November from an eventful visit to America, and it soon became apparent that his health was broken. The doctors, however, saw no cause at first for anxiety, and, in January, he was instituted by the Bishop of London to the important Vicarage of St. John's, Notting Hill.

"It was, I think," writes the Archbishop,¹ "the day after the opening of Parliament that I went with him to consult Sir William Gull. I remained in the outer room fully anticipating that we should have an opinion treating the symptoms of illness as a light matter: but when I was admitted, I saw from the physician's manner that the case was far more grave than any one had supposed. Still all was hopeful. Immediate work was forbidden, but a rest till Easter would probably get the constitution right. Craufurd and I went out together, and no shade of sadness seem to oppress him. He took me by appointment to view the Parsonage at Notting Hill, pointed out to me each room and the improvements he intended to make, and left me to finish his walk through the parish, and his leisurely inspection of it. Meanwhile a deep sadness settled on my heart as we left the Parsonage. . . . I shall never forget the anxious thoughts of that wakeful night. We were still encouraged to be very hopeful, and he was told it was his duty to be inducted as Vicar of St. John's on the 3d of February. . . . It was not till twelve days afterwards

¹ *Catharine and Craufurd Tait*, pp. 101-2.

that his strength altogether broke down. Fever set in with violence, and we found him in great, though not immediate, danger. Then followed three months of the most intense anxiety."

"ADDINGTON, *April 7th, 5th Sunday in Lent*.—Craufurd's eighth Sunday away from Church: but, thank God, he has made progress, though very slowly. God bless him. Yesterday, fifty years ago, my brother Craufurd died. 50 years—half a century! yet how fresh is the remembrance of all that followed! Life is long, but it is drawing to an end.

"*Palm Sunday, 14th April*, ADDINGTON.—Preached to-day in Croydon Parish Church; Holy Communion. I had confirmed there, with the Bishop of Dover, last Monday, 400 candidates.

"On Monday after Confirmation, went to London for the Eastern Debate on the Queen's Message to the House of Lords. Some excellent speeches. Tuesday, Bishopricks Bill, House of Lords. Also Friday, on Lord Leitrim's murder in Donegal. Thoughtful speech by young Lord Dunraven. I am thankful to have no call to live in Ireland. The debate in the Commons on the same subjects seems to have been disgraceful in the extreme. Wednesday and Thursday at home; many clergy staying in the house. Dear Craufurd very weak; has been sitting at his open window. His progress is slow indeed, and both his mother and I feel at times much cast down. Thank God for his gentle equable spirit.

"This week the Bishop of Lichfield has gone from his labours, leaving behind him the memories of an Apostle for his more than twenty years spent in founding and extending the New Zealand Church. A great loss, not only from its positive results, but because of the halo of romance which surrounded him.

"Long interview yesterday with Charles Wood as President of E. C. U., at his request. He is most anxious for some solution of existing difficulties, but has little that seems hopeful to suggest. We shall see. God grant all of us wisdom in these difficult days!"

"ADDINGTON, *Sunday, 12th May, 1878*.—Wednesday of this week to Maidstone and back. Made my annual speech for the Church Building Society. Thursday and Friday in London for business. To-day drove to St. John's, Notting Hill, and preached

for Bishop of London's Fund. I bespoke their prayers for their pastor.

"One evening I had a visit from Mr. —, eager that I should address the Queen against war. The excitement on both sides in the country is great. I answered that we were bound to strengthen the hands of the authorities, and that war would be best avoided by being ready for it.

"To-day I preached on Jonah's message to Nineveh. I have preached a new sermon each week almost since Christmas. This is much better. It gives freshness to my teaching of others, and teaches myself.

"On the 13th an interview at the House of Lords with the ex-Patriarch of the Armenians from Constantinople. I do not think he told me anything I did not know, except as to the wretched state of Armenians in Armenia proper.

"I have spoken in the House of Lords, urging the claims of the wives and children of the Reserve Forces, when the force is called into active service.

"Dear Craufurd was able to come into Chapel to-day to receive the Holy Communion! Thank God for it! We have again seen Sir W. Gull, and are more hopeful."

"*Sunday, May 26th, STONEHOUSE.*—Yesterday we came down here with our precious son. He bore the journey well. We pray earnestly that this wonderful air may work for his restoration. He is very patient and cheerful, thank God! This week has been a busy one. Monday I spoke at the Irish Church meeting; Tuesday, at Christian Evidence Society; Wednesday, at the National Society; Thursday, Incorporated Church Building Society.

"On Monday was the great debate on the moving of the Indian troops to Malta. The Chancellor and ex-Chancellor spoke each for two hours; not very lively. Dizzy was in a happy vein, being resolved to give no information.

"Both Monday and Wednesday night I stayed at Lambeth and did a good deal of work. It is peaceful down here, and the sea lovely. Holy Communion in St. Peter's Church to-day and a good sermon from Style. Read some of George Moore's Life, and some *Letters of Verax*."

It is a difficult task for the Biographer to describe, either directly or by quotation, the events of the next six

months. The story has been told by the Archbishop himself in the published memoir of his wife and son, and it seems best to extract from that record such portions as are necessary to make the references in the Diary clear.

"It was on Saturday the 25th of May," writes the Archbishop, "when the bright summer was beginning to burst, that Craufurd left Addington. . . . The journey to Stonehouse, which occupied in all about four hours, was well accomplished. It seemed almost as if the experiment had answered, for on Sunday and Monday he was certainly no worse, and, we hoped, rather better. Unexpectedly on Tuesday he complained that he did not feel as usual. I was advised to break an appointment for a meeting at Maidstone, and send my chaplain in my place. It was indeed mercifully arranged that I did not go, for before my chaplain could return, though he came back as soon as possible, and reached us on Wednesday about seven o'clock, it was only to find us kneeling round the dear lifeless form of the friend whom he loved as we did. . . . About five o'clock the Bishop of Ripon and I had walked down to the cliff, and as we returned we met C. in great alarm. Dr. Raven had just told her that Craufurd was much worse. In less than an hour he was gone. Nothing could be more blessed than his end. When I proposed the Holy Communion he asked if there was immediate danger. I said Raven had advised us to have the service at once. He instantly understood the situation and joined in the service, in parts with a heavenly and triumphant look. . . . The presence of those he loved greatly cheered and comforted him. He was the calmest of us all, and almost seemed to be helping us to bear up. He addressed kind messages to each, turned on his side like a tired child, and fell asleep in Jesus. Blessed end to a manly, simple life; yet not the end—rather surely the beginning of a new life into which he passed, while he left us overwhelmed by his bedside."

Of the funeral the Archbishop writes thus in his Diary:—

"*Whit Sunday, June 9th, 1878, STONEHOUSE.*—Last Tuesday at Addington, a holy and most peaceful though grievous day. It was a solemn gathering. Constable came from Scotland; relations, clergy, my friends, the stalwart form and healthy faces of his

own young friends—all these were there, and all the parish, and our neighbours. Each day since, the heavy load, the aching void, and yet the blessed cheerful thoughts of him who is gone. I long to write more of him. Truly, during his long illness he set himself his work uncomplaining. Each day he was never happy till his letters were written, and then he had a great deal of reading. When I would tell him what I had been doing he answered, joking, ‘And I have taken my quinine,’ for it was his day’s work to try to get well if God willed, and on the last sad Wednesday he as quietly set himself to that day’s work, which was to die. Always when I came to him we had, morning and evening, a short prayer together. His first demand each morning was for his ‘Bishop Andrewes,’ that he might pray, and his dear mother read the service with him morning and evening. These days of lingering weakness were all truly hallowed. Daily his character ripened in uncomplaining cheerful submission. His sense of humour too was infinite. This is a great gift from God for all sufferers.”

“*23d June*, STONEHOUSE.—Yesterday was his birthday—29—a day ever marked. Oh, how to pass through yesterday. . . . I have been turning my thoughts when I could to the preparation of my addresses for the coming meetings of the Bishops. Oh Lord, guide me and assist me in this work. I had hoped to have him as a great help in the difficult work, and specially to have been helped by the friendships he had made in America. Well, shall I not be so helped? and can I doubt that he will be more really present than if he had been detained down here at Stonehouse by lingering illness? The thought most present to my mind to-day is that the time of mourning is short. In three years and a half I shall be 70. I must meet him soon; the other mourners may have long years before them; I cannot. This death tolls the last watch in a life which has been mysteriously divided by solemn, sudden warnings. Oh Lord, give me grace in the time that remains to make the evening of my life and the close of my Episcopate what he would have wished. The distractions of society may now be set aside; I scarcely think I shall be drawn into any disquieting conflicts; I would meditate on the past, look forward to the remote future, and strive each day to live in patient, quiet work, as waiting for the Lord’s summons—more care for the poor, more anxious striving to be considerate for all good men, more efforts to set a holy example in my family and neighbour-

hood, more solicitude for the wants of individual parishes in the Diocese, more earnest prayer that I may accomplish these quiet works. Lord, help me, as the evening draws on."

"STONEHOUSE, 30th *June*.—Monday went to London in time for Maclagan's consecration. Four hours' ceremonial in St. Paul's. I got pretty well through my part, except that I could scarcely contain myself in administering the Elements to Maclagan, thinking of Craufurd's reverence for him and of his last visit to Addington and his prayer with Craufurd. Wilkinson's sermon had many materials for thought. . . . Tuesday, preliminary examination of 26 candidates for Orders. Thursday, S. P. G. service in St. Paul's; many Bishops from America and elsewhere, as at Maclagan's consecration, all gathering for the Conference. What an interest all this would have been to Craufurd; but how sad would it have been had he been slowly dying all the while. God arranges our griefs as our joys. Each meeting with a friend of his from America has been a stab, yet how pleasant to think of the gracious memories he left in that land. Friday, S. P. G. meeting in St. James's Hall; in chair till worn out; spoke, not without difficulty. The Conference was full of interest. Saturday, all day at Canterbury to meet the Bishops coming to the Conference. Forty present in the Cathedral, when I addressed them from Augustine's chair. I could scarcely bear up while I was addressing the Americans. Home here in the evening. Remarkable sermon to-day from Whitehead, on Deborah and Jael, making the latter the representative of strong-minded females setting forth with hammer and nail to do man's work, and doing it wrongly. Holy Communion. How I longed at times for that dear companionship which Craufurd's death has taken from me! 'We took sweet counsel together and walked in the House of God as friends.'"

"LAMBETH, 7th *July* 1878.—On Monday we left our quiet home by the sea, now sanctified to us more than ever by the events of the last six weeks, and plunged at once into our life at Lambeth. Many Bishops and others in the house. Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday were occupied by the Conference. A most remarkable assembly; the details of each day will be found in the Extract Book and in the secret reports of the Debates. The partially restored Chapel welcomed the procession of nearly a hundred Bishops, coming down the Gallery and entering the West door. What interest our beloved son would have taken in it all!

His place was supplied by D. The arrival of each Bishop from America brought the same story of the love he gained among them. I rejoice that he made that tour, for it has left a sweet memory of him beyond the Atlantic. Each day there has been luncheon in the Guard Room for all the Bishops, and many have found their way to join the family in the little dining-room. Perhaps all this, with the attendant business, has not been bad for us; certainly it has never for a moment driven from our minds the one absorbing thought."

"LAMBETH, *Sunday, July 14, 1878*.—Preached my first sermon since our great loss, 'Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth.' A large congregation of our Lambeth neighbours. During the week we have had committee meetings daily, and we have now had every one of the American Bishops as our guests."

"LAMBETH, *July 21, 1878*.—This week has been occupied by committees and other incidental work of the Lambeth Conference. On Thursday House of Lords till late. Lord Beaconsfield's and Lord Salisbury's statements on their return from the Congress. It really looks as if a great career were opening before England in the civilised nations of the East. A remarkable sermon to-day on the prospects of Christianity in China by Bishop Schereschewsky [of Shanghai]. I administered Holy Communion."

"LAMBETH, *Sunday, July 28*.—Thank God the Conference has ended well. Everything has been conducted in the best possible spirit. Though there have been one or two approaches to an exciting scene, especially (1) on the subject of issuing an Encyclical, (2) on the resolutions respecting Ritual and Confession, it only required a good night's rest, and perhaps some dexterity in the Chairman, to get all rightly arranged in the morning. The papers tell all the world is to know at present of our proceedings, and the chest in the Lambeth Library will preserve details for future generations. My impression is, that by God's great goodness in answer to prayer, we have done a good work for the Church, and I believe that the most uneasy spirits will be inclined to listen to the almost unanimous voice of a hundred Bishops. The kindly feeling between ourselves and the Americans, and indeed between the home and all the distant Bishops, has been most marked. The gathering in St. Paul's yesterday for the Holy Communion was most impressive. The sermon by Bishop Stevens of Penn-

sylvania was exactly what was wanted. In the apse behind the great altar I bade them farewell in a few words. So ends a most eventful month. May God's blessing attend our work! We have had some 90 Bishops at luncheon every day, and friends staying in the house. Now we shall return to our quiet life. The thought of our sorrow has never left us."

"16th August 1878, DREI KÖNIGE, BASLE.—We have reached this place by hurrying through the night from Brussels, which has grown into a splendid modern city since I visited it first some 40 years ago. Spent some hours at Waterloo on Wednesday. The monuments of so many Protestants in a Roman Catholic Church might be a lesson on tolerance to some of our people. . . . And now we are here, left to our own quiet thoughts. I thank God for the relief which this change gives from the claims of business, rudely forcing us to swallow our sorrow as best we might. My thoughts are much impressed, since dear Craufurd left us, with the nearness of the two worlds. His entrance behind the veil was scarcely such a parting as his leaving us for America last year, or six years ago for the East. It is true he will not come back to us, but I, certainly before long, must go to him. I have been reading a good deal of Mrs. Oliphant's *Montalembert*. The account of his romance about Ireland, and the way in which his visit to that isle of saints affected his whole life, was quite new to me. He seems to have thought Ireland the most truly religious country in the world, the very impersonation in its people of the union of love of liberty with deep religion. Another proof how difficult it is for visitors to form true ideas of any country. He might be right about Ireland, but certainly the proof is slight on which his impression rests; principally derived from the troops of kneeling peasants whom he saw near the chapel at Blarney, and his bright-eyed little guide, who sang psalms and the *Angelus* by the wayside. I despair of knowing anything for certain of the real life of any people without living long amongst them. I have been much struck with what Mrs. Oliphant says of Albert, the hero of the *Récit d'une Sœur*—that he was one of those whom God compensated for an early death by making him the object of love wherever he moved in his short life. Montalembert devoted his life to an impossible task: to make Rome other than she is, and, like Newman, he was obliged to succumb to her gigantic force and take her as she is. The dedication of his daughter as a nun, to his sad grief, is a touching proof to me of the false

position in which he stood, substituting romance for real religious independence. His hatred of the name of Luther is childish. His acknowledgment of the high religious condition of England is an answer to his whole system. It is impossible not to admire the man in spite of the utter unreasonableness of his romantic system."

"ADDINGTON, *Sunday, 6th October* 1878.—The return to Addington has been accomplished. On Tuesday I preached at the opening of Kennington Church; some 40 clergy present, and an immense gathering; reached Lambeth late. Wednesday at Lambeth. Thursday, drove down here. This is now our third day and first Sunday. The thought of dear Craufurd is with us everywhere within and without the house. As soon as we arrived Catharine and I walked down to see the dear grave still bright with flowers. . . .

"It was a great distress to me at the Holy Communion last week at — to be irritated and startled at the most sacred moment by one of those trifling alterations which grate against my feeling. Lord, pardon my weakness! I am too apt to be upset and irritated by such things. The clergy have nowadays a very difficult task, to conciliate one set of their people without irritating another; and there is always the danger that the introduction and the omission of certain things are alike irritating, though to different sets of people. Oh Lord, teach me to rise to the great realities, and to be above being influenced by small trivial matters. Give me real charity and fairness."

"ADDINGTON, *Nov. 3d.*—The time for the marriage is drawing near, and we are a good deal occupied with thoughts of it. . . . Incessant correspondence this week. I have prepared a sermon on 'The new Heavens and the new Earth,' which I preached to-day at Shirley. Golightly has been here—an old friend of 40 years. Friday was All Saints—a day of very tender memories. Knollys preached a touching sermon on 'The rest of the departed.' I have finished Mozley on *Laud*, and begun Carlyle's account of 'Covenanter Baillie.' Read Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln on 'The Spirits in Prison.' Finished Gladstone on the Sixteenth Century and the Nineteenth."

It is necessary to turn again from the private Diary to the Archbishop's published narrative in the *Memoir of Catharine and Craufurd Tait* (p. 115):—

"The sadness of our return to Addington was cheered by the prospect of our second daughter's marriage in November. . . . My dear wife rejoiced that I was able to preach each Sunday. The last was a solemn day: the window which the people of Addington had erected in love for Craufurd had been put up the night before. She heard me preach for the last time—the text, 'Sorrowful, yet alway rejoicing.' Our hearts were full of the past 4th of June and the coming 12th of November. We had felt that we could not bear having the marriage, as we should have desired, in our lovely little country parish church, and it was settled that we should leave Addington on Monday, and that my daughter and my chaplain should be married in the restored Lambeth Chapel.

"Tuesday, 12th November, was a solemn as well as a joyful day. Before breakfast, all who were staying in the Palace met for Holy Communion, with the bride and bridegroom, and many noted the heavenly expression of sadness, mingled with joy, in my dear wife's face. None were invited but near relations and intimate friends, and those immediately connected with our household, yet the number swelled to some 120 in the chapel, and the post-room and ante-chapel were filled with some of our poorer neighbours. . . . After the service, the party gathered in the Great Dining Hall, and soon afterwards the mother bade farewell to her daughter, whom she was never to see on earth again. We assembled once again in the chapel for prayer that evening, commending the bride and bridegroom to God's care, and commemorating the dear brother of whom all were thinking. Next morning, we four remaining members of the family were off by the Scotch express direct for Edinburgh. The Bishop of Carlisle and Mrs. Goodwin had kindly offered us that we should rest at Rose Castle, and at first I had thought my wife would like it, as she had visited the loved grave of our daughters every year. But she said, No; she could not bear now, under her fresh sorrow, to open the wounds of old days. One kind friend, ever sharing in our joy and sadness, was at the train to speed us on our journey—the same who after three short weeks received us on our return—I widowed, my daughters motherless."

Several visits are recorded, and on Wednesday November 29, they returned from Glasgow to Edinburgh, Mrs. Tait being very unwell.

"It was now plain that she must rest awhile; though we had no apprehension but that she would be well in a few days. It was on Thursday evening that a serious change was seen. She became rapidly worse and very weak. . . . On Saturday she was utterly prostrated, and spoke to her eldest daughter of what she wished in the event of her death. She was perfectly calm and collected; but though, when I was with her, she spoke with exceeding tenderness and thankfulness of our five-and-thirty years of wedded love, and said how she hoped that she might live, once more to see her married daughter, for 'Christmas would be sad without the mother,' yet we hoped even still that she was only nervous from weakness. . . . On the Sunday she was worse. By mid-day her case was hopeless. Her speech—from the setting in of congestion of the lungs—had become very difficult, but when roused she had all her mental faculties entire. She had settled on the day before that she would receive the Communion on this day—Advent Sunday. I reminded her how she had looked forward to a glorious celebration of it in Durham Cathedral. We were now in great alarm of some sudden termination, or of unconsciousness coming on, and it would have left a sad memory if she had departed without that solemn rite, through which her soul had always rejoiced to hold communion with her Saviour. But still for several hours she was entirely herself. I administered the Holy Communion to her, to her daughters, and to the physician. She joined in all so far as her impeded speech would allow. I said to her the 'Nunc Dimittis,' and she repeated it with me. I said to her, 'Lord, I have loved the habitation of Thine house,' and she added, 'And the place where Thine honour dwelleth.' I tried to go through the hymn, 'Jesus, Lover of my soul,' and when I faltered she supplied the missing words. Then, after a time of rest, as of old on all Sundays—in the Deanery, at Fulham and London House, at Lambeth and at Addington—her daughters sang to her some favourite hymns—'Lo! he comes with clouds descending,' and 'Lead, kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom.' When they had finished, I repeated to her again the last lines, inscribed by her desire on the frame of Grispi's picture of the children who left her at Carlisle—

'And with the morn those Angel faces smile,
Which I have loved long since, and lost awhile.'

'Yes, yes,' she repeated, and either then, or a few minutes before,

she spoke of those of us who had gone before stretching out their hands to welcome her. The physician wished her again to rest. Soon she became unconscious, and about ten o'clock, after I had offered up the Commendatory Prayer, her breathing ceased with a gentle sigh, and she was gone.

"Thus ended her earthly life of fifty-nine years—refreshed from her childhood onwards, through the grace of God, by a well-spring of joy within, which poured forth in acts of kindness to all whom she could reach; a life sanctified by prayer, disciplined by abundant suffering, ever thankful to God, active, cheerful, mixing in the world's innocent enjoyments, and resolute to fulfil all worldly duties; yet not of the world—meet preparation for the life of a glorified saint in the immediate presence of the Father and Redeemer."

On the 7th of December—it was her newly married daughter's twentieth birthday—all of her that could die was laid to rest in Addington Churchyard, beside her boy, not now under the summer sun, but in a cold misty afternoon. The chief mourner spoke the Benediction at the grave. The Archbishop of York took part in the service, and there were present the Bishops of London, Winchester, St. Albans, Rochester, Dover, and others, and an immense gathering of the Archbishop's friends. The Queen was represented by the Dean of Windsor. The funeral ended, the family, including the newly-married daughter, who with her husband had hurried back from Florence, to meet her father at Lambeth, went down, as on the 4th of June, to Stonehouse the same evening.¹

"STONEHOUSE, *Dec. 15th, 1878, Third Sunday in Advent.*—A fortnight to-day since that last sad Advent Sunday in Edinburgh, a fortnight since that happy meeting between mother and son, of which the joyful meeting here last year on Craufurd's return from America was a faint foreshadowing—very faint compared with the blessedness of this last meeting, where there is no more disappointment from failing health or anxious hopes unfulfilled. . . . The number of our family is eleven, and seven of

¹ See *Catharine and Craufurd Tait*, p. 376.

them are safe, resting in the presence of the Lord. Shall not we who remain have every thought of every hour solemnised by the shadow of our grief and by the brightness of the thankful joy which breaks through it, even its darkest hours?"

"STONEHOUSE, *Dec. 22, 1878, Fourth Sunday in Advent.*—This morning, — preached at St. Peter's a most touching sermon on the chastened joy of Christmas, pointing out how the three days which follow Christmas speak of those removed in childhood, and in the vigour of early manhood, and those spared to know the sorrows of old age, those who die in childhood not dying without fruit, if, as is often the case, their early death mould all the future lives of those who mourn for them. Holy Communion. This afternoon I have had a touching little service in the Orphanage for the Confirmation of two servants. Yesterday was my birthday—67. We have been reading in the evenings, as of old—the History of the English Church of the 18th Century, and Sir James Stephen's somewhat inflated essays on 'The Clapham Sect,' and on 'Wilberforce.' Many lessons to be learned for the present day from the difficulties to which the Bishops of the Church generally were exposed in the endeavour to moderate and quiet the zeal of Wesley and Whitfield. It is curious to observe how arguments respecting the limits of canonical obedience, common nowadays, were familiar also to the leaders of the Methodists. Have read to-day the lecture of the Bishop of Ely on *Andrewes' Devotions*.

"STONEHOUSE, *Sunday, Jan. 5th, 1879.*—The New Year has come. We bid farewell to 1878, with all its sad history, a year more sad even than 1856. But what blessings have the one-and-twenty years from 1856 to the end of 1877 conferred on us! How deeply to be prized the joy of that daily growing love of mother and of son! What a store of bright memories have these one-and-twenty years laid up!"

CHAPTER XXVIII.

COLONIAL AND MISSIONARY PROBLEMS—OATH OF OBEDIENCE — MADAGASCAR — CHINA—CEYLON—SECOND LAMBETH CONFERENCE.

1870-1880.

THE references in the last chapter to the Lambeth Conference of 1878 lead naturally to some account of the Archbishop's relation to the Colonial and Missionary work of the Church of England. His keen and far-reaching interest in all departments of that work, and the outspoken independence of his attitude, have been sufficiently exhibited in the account already given of the Colenso controversies of 1863-1868, and of the first Lambeth Conference of 1867. The news of his accession to the Primacy was received with no small alarm by those Colonial Churchmen who regarded Bishop Wilberforce as their home representative, and Bishop Gray as their champion in the field; and the gradual disappearance, during his tenure of the Archbishopric, of any such feeling of distrust is in itself a striking tribute to the careful and calm statesmanship he exhibited in what is perhaps the most delicate and complicated of the Primate's manifold responsibilities. The years, too, during which he held the office were years of special difficulty with respect both to the Colonial and the missionary branches of the Church. In the Colonies, a process of quasi-'disestablishment' was everywhere going on. As one by one the Bishops who

had been appointed by the Crown under letters-patent died or resigned their Sees, they were succeeded by others who held no such State-authority, and the utmost care and skill were necessary in the reconstructions which ensued, in order, on the one hand, to preserve all possible connection with the still established Church at home, and, on the other, to secure for each Colonial diocese or province a suitable measure of autonomy. Some of the difficulties which thus arose might have seemed at first sight to be merely technical, but large principles lay behind the technicalities, and justified the earnestness with which they were discussed. The subject, for example, of the oath of canonical obedience to be taken by a Colonial or missionary Bishop, consecrated in England by the Archbishop of Canterbury, gave rise to a voluminous correspondence, more than once renewed, between the Archbishop and Bishop Gray of Capetown. The Archbishop, encouraged by strong representations both from Canada and Australia, was anxious, at least during the transition period, to emphasise the existing connection between the Home and the Colonial Church by the observance of an unwritten rule that a Bishop consecrated in England by the Archbishop of Canterbury for a diocese outside the Queen's dominions should take an oath of canonical obedience to the See of Canterbury, as representing the Mother Church, from which, in some sense, he derived his 'mission.' Bishop Gray, on the other hand, with a stern and logical disregard of the anomalies of the situation, swept any such consideration aside. While he still desired that such Bishops should have the prestige attaching to consecration by the Primate of the Church at home, he wished the Archbishop to act in such a case merely on behalf of the Colonial Metropolitan, to whom alone, as he argued, could any such oath be legitimately taken. The

Archbishop called attention to statutable difficulties in the matter. These, the Bishop of Capetown replied, were a mere "cobweb which scarce needs brushing away."

"Why, in a merely technical matter," he wrote, "should the observance of the law be strained just at the point at which such observance will bring it into collision with the laws and customs of the universal Church, and of our own branch in particular?"

The Archbishop, however, declined to give way, declaring his inability to "alter, at his individual discretion, the oath prescribed in the Consecration Service"; but he cordially approved of such consecration taking place, if desired, either at Capetown or elsewhere, where no such limitations were imposed by law. The whole correspondence was made public, and, although too technical for reproduction in this volume, the letters are admirably illustrative of the general position taken up on either side in the controversy.¹ When Bishop Jones was consecrated by the Archbishop a few years later, as Bishop Gray's successor in the diocese of Capetown, it was arranged that he should himself take the usual oath of obedience to the Archbishop, on the understanding, embodied in a written memorandum, that he was not thereby compromising the Metropolical privileges of his See.²

It was probably impossible to solve the problem in a perfectly logical and consistent way, unless, indeed, the Archbishop had been willing to reduce the position of the See of Canterbury to the level of any Colonial or missionary province that might be formed. It was his endeavour, on the contrary, to maintain as long as possible, while the Colonial Church was growing into firmer shape,

¹ They will be found in full in the *Guardian* of November 23, 1870, pp. 1377-9.

² For the full text of the memoranda, see *Guardian* of May 20, 1874, p. 627.

the connection, sufficiently understood, though not easy to define, between the Primatial See of Canterbury and its various offshoots throughout the world. He had to deal with similar difficulties, of one kind or another, in every quarter of the globe. Canada, the West Indies, Mauritius, New Zealand, India, China, Japan, contributed each of them in turn a problem to be solved, and this at a moment when it was, above all things, desirable to give the local Churches time to grow, before rigidly defining, by enactment or precedent, the limitations of their independent rights. He may have acted wisely or unwisely in any individual case, but at least he was neither eager for an increase of power, nor incautiously ready to lighten the burden of his responsibilities.

Not less formidable, and certainly not less complicated, were the difficulties which beset the relation of the Primate to the more definitely 'Missionary' work of the Church beyond the sea. The problems are, in such cases, of an even larger sort, with conditions and issues religious rather than ecclesiastical, requiring for their solution a familiarity with the traditions and management of the great missionary societies, and sometimes a local and even a linguistic knowledge unacquirable at home. To describe these difficulties in general terms would be impossible. Probably their character may be best illustrated by the selection of a few specimen instances—actual and concrete—of disputes which did as a matter of fact arise and, along with many others, find their way at last to Lambeth. It is not easy to select appropriate or interesting examples, but perhaps the three following stories, drawn from widely different mission fields, may sufficiently serve the purpose.

To explain the first of these, a short retrospect is necessary.

In the year 1818 a band of English Nonconformists, under the London Missionary Society, established a strong Mission in the island of Madagascar. They reduced the language to writing, taught the natives to read and to write, translated the whole Bible into their language, and made many converts. Some fifteen years afterwards the reigning Queen expelled the missionaries from the island, and commenced a cruel and bloody persecution against the native Christians. In 1861 this Queen, Ranavalona, died, and the island was again opened to traders and to missionaries. When the agents of the London Missionary Society returned to their work, it was found that instead of the persecution having checked the progress of Christianity, the converts now numbered many thousands, where before there had been hundreds. Bishop Ryan of Mauritius visited the new King, Radama II., and, after conference with the London Missionary Society, it was agreed that the Missions in the capital of the island should be left as before to the Independents, and that such work as might be undertaken by missionaries of the Church of England should be confined to the coast districts and superintended by Bishop Ryan from Mauritius. The Church Missionary Society, which had a few missionaries in the island, cordially consented to this arrangement. But it seems never to have been embodied in any official document. After some years a movement was set on foot for the establishment of a Bishopric of the Church of England to superintend all Church Missionaries labouring in the island. This was earnestly promoted by Bishop Wilberforce and others, and it was impossible, it was said, that the verbal compact which Bishop Ryan had made in 1862 could be allowed to prevent an English Bishop from having free access to any mission district in the island. Then the London

Missionary Society spoke out in hot protest, and brought all possible influence to bear upon the Government to prevent what they regarded as the mere disturbance of a work in which they had been engaged for years. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel were earnest in urging the absolute necessity of the proposed Bishopric. The Church Missionary Society, while recognising the need of Episcopal superintendence for their Missions, thought that such superintendence ought to be exercised, as heretofore, from the neighbouring island of Mauritius.¹ It was at this juncture that the Archbishop found himself appealed to by the various parties concerned. On his inquiring whether the Government would be prepared to grant him a licence for the consecration of a Bishop for this Island Mission, Lord Granville, the Foreign Secretary, replied in a guarded manner, and adopted in his letter so much of the language of the protest issued by the London Missionary Society as to make it obvious whence his arguments had been derived. An immense correspondence followed, each of the parties concerned stating their case in emphatic terms, and each throwing themselves with confidence upon the Archbishop's support.

Is it possible, asked the London Missionary Society, that you can ignore the position our Missionaries have won for themselves and for their Church in the island? The population is rapidly becoming Christian, and its Christianity and its civilisation alike are due to what our Missionaries have done. Can any reasonable Christian desire to introduce into this infant Church the wrangles and confusion from which they have hitherto been free, and which will immediately arise if rival Missionaries with a rival Church system are set down side by side in

¹ Mauritius is about 500 miles to the east of Madagascar.

the capital? We rely indeed upon the compact, made in 1863 by Bishop Ryan, that Church Missionaries would keep clear of the region of our work; but we rely still more upon the larger and truer principles of Missionary work, that, while thousands of heathen remain untouched, the various denominations should observe St. Paul's rule of not beginning their work where others are already in the field. This is what we understand Bishop Selwyn to have done in the islands of Melanesia, and we feel confident that the Archbishop will support us in insisting that the principle should be observed in Madagascar.

This was one side. On the other, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, with Bishop Wilberforce and Lord Nelson at its head, and Bishop Gray thundering in the background, protested in the most vehement terms against the observance of such an arrangement. "Here is a great island, they said, which apparently may before long become altogether Christian. Its people are feeling their way towards the adoption of the faith. Everything will hereafter depend upon what has now been done to guide them wisely, and to lay foundations which shall be solid because they are based upon the whole truth. There are Romanists and others at work in Madagascar, besides the Independents. Why is the Church of England alone to be excluded, or obliged to work with her hands tied, because of a verbal compact, which was after all of a conversational kind, made ten years ago, under different conditions from those of to-day? a compact which Bishop Ryan had no authority to make, and which did not really bind anybody. It is impossible for the Church of England to look on passively at the growth of a native Christianity which is based upon a system fundamentally wrong because lacking the essential of an Episcopate. On the Archbishop of Canterbury it clearly devolves to set this

question at rest for ever by asserting with no doubtful voice that the Church can only work according to the system which has come down to her from Apostolic days, and that she would be faithless to her trust did she adopt or acquiesce in any other. Let the Government be called upon to issue the usual licence for the consecration of a Bishop, and a few years after his consecration we shall hear no more of this preposterous claim to a monopoly of the right to teach Christianity at the capital, where alone it can bear its proper fruit."

On each of these sides the argument was perfectly clear. Between the two stood the Church Missionary Society, which fell back, as was natural, upon the compact made by Bishop Ryan at a time when the only Episcopal Missionaries in the island belonged to their own Society. "We are quite satisfied," they said, "with Episcopal supervision from Mauritius. We could not in honour consent to any arrangement which should allow any Missionaries but those of the Independents to work in the capital. If the Bishop of Mauritius will not continue to supervise our work we may be forced to have a Bishop on the spot ; but at least he must be debarred from interfering with the work-field which has so long and so valiantly been occupied by our Independent brethren."

Backwards and forwards among these parties the controversy was bandied in a series of letters and protocols and memoranda drawn up by the various Societies, and emphasised from the platforms of public meetings. The Archbishop held conference after conference with the authorities representing each body of controversialists, and the problem, already complicated enough, was made increasingly difficult by personal questions respecting the various men who were named by the Societies as possible Bishops, supposing a Bishop to be consecrated. He

succeeded to the Primacy in December 1868, and not till May 1873 was he able formally and finally to request the Government to grant him a licence for the consecration of a Bishop. Then arose a new complication. The Government, under the pressure of Nonconformist opinion, backed by that of Lord Shaftesbury and others within the Church, declined to give him any such licence. The refusal was a serious blow to those who had hoped that, owing to the Archbishop's considerate treatment of each party in the controversy, the difficulties were at an end, and that the new Bishop would go out with all the weight and authority attaching to one who had been consecrated in Westminster Abbey by the Primate of All England. Without the Royal Licence this was impossible, and some of the promoters of the Bishopric spoke out in wrath against the Government's "unwarrantable interference" with the Church's distinctly spiritual work. Such was the attitude Bishop Gray had adopted from the first. In the action of the Government he saw a fresh reason for disestablishment.

"Lord Granville," he said, "is assuming to himself the right to decide what shall be the constitution of the Church's Missions. . . . Can we wonder that those who love their Church are day by day demanding in increased numbers that she shall be set free from this oppressive thralldom?"¹

The Archbishop, who certainly had better cause than any other man to know what was to be said upon all sides of the question, took a calmer view. He fell back upon what had been done a hundred years before in the case of Bishop Seabury, and requested the Scottish Bishops to allow the consecration to take place across the Border, where no Royal Licence was required. In a

¹ *Bishop Gray's Life*, vol. ii. p. 510.

final letter to Mr. Bullock, the Secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, he summed up the case as follows :—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Secretary of S. P. G.

“LAMBETH PALACE, 21 May 1873.

“MY DEAR MR. BULLOCK,—I have carefully considered the resolutions passed by the Board of the S. P. G. on the 16th inst. respecting the proposed Bishopric in Madagascar.

“I have before me the letter of H. M.’s principal Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, dated May 15, in which his Lordship says that he has given the fullest consideration to the subject of the request addressed to him with reference to the appointment of a Bishop of the Church of England to reside in the island of Madagascar, adding, ‘My colleagues and myself have come to the conclusion that the Queen cannot be recommended to grant H. M.’s Royal Licence for the consecration of such a Bishop.’

“Now, the appointment of such a Bishop, as you well know, has been a subject of much discussion and diversity of opinion both within and without the Church of England. You were present at the conference held here last year between a deputation of the S. P. G. and certain deputed members of the C. M. S., and you are aware that at the time great diversity of opinion manifested itself as to the propriety of appointing such a Bishop, and as to the limits within which his operations ought to be confined in the event of his appointment. The Church Missionary Society, as I understand, has since withdrawn its Missionaries from the island of Madagascar, and ceases, I believe, to offer any opposition to the appointment of a Bishop.

“The cause of any difference of opinion having ever existed within the Church of England as to the appointment of such a Bishop is to be traced to the strong feeling entertained by many of the most attached members of our Church as to the rule, that a certain understanding ought to be acted on, whereby Protestant Missionaries consider themselves bound to respect each other’s labours, and none of them to interfere with fields already occupied by their brethren. Considering the boundless area of unreclaimed heathenism, and feeling how undesirable it is that the unformed minds of new converts abroad should be disturbed

by the controversies which unhappily often keep Christians apart at home, I fully assent to this rule, and hold it to be the Christian duty of the Church of England to act accordingly wherever the rule be fairly applicable. Now, the London Missionary Society, from its indefatigable and successful labours in Madagascar, is, in my judgment, fully entitled to be regarded as the instrument whose work has been blessed by God for the conversion of the great mass of such inhabitants in that island as are Christians. But Madagascar is of vast extent, and, successful as the London Missionary Society has been, there are thousands upon thousands spread over the island who acknowledge no connection with that Society. Hence many and diverse missionary efforts have been made in the island by the various Christian communities of Europe, and, as was to be naturally expected, the Missionaries of the Church of England have not been left behind, and their converts are now a considerable body. All the other Christian communities, as I understand, are represented in the island, with their organisation fully developed. It has been brought before us, especially by Bishop Ryan, who powerfully advocated the appointment of a Bishop in the Board of the C. M. Society, that our Church must, as is obvious, be at a great disadvantage if our converts cannot be confirmed, and no steps can be taken for the ordination of a native pastorate in our communion. Bishop Ryan, who, as you know, has visited the island, and is intimately acquainted with all the circumstances of the case, urged that the work of confirmation and ordination cannot be satisfactorily accomplished by the occasional visits of a Bishop from Mauritius or elsewhere. Hence the application which was made through me by your Society.

“But a difficulty stands in the way. The London Missionary Society, knowing the peculiar condition of Madagascar, and the feelings of deference with which any act of the Crown of England is sure to be regarded by the civil authorities in the capital of Madagascar, is, as I understand, alarmed lest the advent of a Bishop consecrated under the licence of our Queen should be taken as a declaration on the part of England that our Government desires to cast some slur on the labours of those pastors who cannot conscientiously submit themselves to the authority of a Bishop so consecrated. It is not improbable, also, that it is thought difficulties may arise with foreign Powers, if our Queen, without any request from the Sovereign of Madagascar, or any

formal intimation that the step will be agreeable to the Madagascar Government, assumes authority to issue the licence required. I am, therefore, not surprised at the refusal of the request which your Society has forwarded through me, and I understand the refusal to be based on the grounds I have stated.

"You will readily perceive that I consider Her Majesty's representatives to have, according to the constitution of the Church of England, as full a right as the Propagation of the Gospel Society, or any individual prelates, or other members of the Church, to make their opinion felt on the general question of the policy, in the interests of the Church of England and Christianity, of appointing a Bishop of the Church of England for Madagascar. Indeed, I would remind you, a practical veto at each stage of this matter is possessed by the Society which originated the scheme, by myself, who was requested to forward it, and by the Government to whom the request was made. The lay element in the administration of the Church of England has many constitutional modes of making itself legitimately felt. The application for this Bishopric rests on the votes of your lay as well as clerical members. There seems, therefore, no ground for complaint, if the lay authorities, with whom the issuing of the licence rests, think it their duty to decline the proposal made to them. I have, however, stated the grounds on which I believe the answer sent to us has been based; and these grounds seem to me in no wise inconsistent with your Society taking any other steps which may be open to them for securing confirmation and ordination for their converts, and the due subordination of their missionaries to a Bishop's authority. The Episcopal Church of Scotland has, under somewhat similar circumstances, when like difficulties intervened, lent its aid in previous times; by the consecration of Bishop Seabury in 1784 for Connecticut; by the consecration of Bishop Luscombe in 1825 for the benefit of our countrymen residing in Paris; and, quite recently, by the consecration of a Bishop for the Orange River Territory, when obstacles occurred to his consecration by myself, without taking to me the oath of canonical obedience.

"Under these circumstances, I shall throw no impediment in the way, if your Society thinks fit to hand over this part of its missionary work to the Primus and other Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church, requesting them to aid you. And if a Bishop be selected and consecrated by them, who is of such a

turn of mind as rightly to understand the difficulties of his position—a man of large heart who can appreciate also all Christian efforts for the conversion of the heathen, by whomsoever made—I can have little doubt that none of the contentions which some at present anticipate will arise, but that any undisciplined zeal on the part of young Missionaries, which might minister to such contentions, will be duly checked and regulated, and great results will follow, not only for the furtherance of our own Missionary efforts, but also for the promotion of Christianity, in whatever form it exists in Madagascar.—I remain, dear Mr. Bullock, yours very truly,
A. C. CANTUAR."

The Archbishop's advice was followed. On February 2, 1874 Bishop Kestell Cornish was consecrated by the Scottish Bishops in Edinburgh as Missionary-Bishop of Madagascar. Probably no single party among the controversialists was quite satisfied, but a workable solution had been arrived at, and after a time the disputations died away.

If the troubles and disputes of Madagascar illustrate one department of the missionary problems constantly pressing upon the attention and time of the Archbishop, there were others of even graver import, involving, as has been already said, questions religious rather than ecclesiastical. Such, to take a single instance, was the long-standing controversy as to the Chinese term for God. As in the Madagascar case, so here, a short account of the matter in dispute will serve better than a host of letters to suggest the varied character of the Archbishop's foreign correspondence.

For more than two centuries the Christian missionaries at work in China have experienced a grave practical difficulty as to the Chinese word which would best convey to converts or inquirers the Christian idea of God. Three words at least are in use among Christian teachers, and most of the adherents of each term regard the advocates

of every other as encouraging false doctrine of the gravest sort.

The Jesuit missionaries of the seventeenth century adopted in their formularies and teaching the term *Shang-ti* as a well-known Chinese name of Almighty God. Other teachers belonging to the Church of Rome denounced the use of such a term, on account of its being already the proper name of a heathen god, and therefore certain, in their opinion, to introduce confusion into the minds of converts. By a Papal rescript issued early in the eighteenth century it was enjoined that, for the future, the more general word *Tien-Chu* (Lord of Heaven) should be alone employed in every Chinese Mission of the Roman Church. When Protestant Missions were established, the missionaries employed both terms, the older use (*Shang-ti*) obtaining on the whole the larger support; while a third party introduced a new usage, employing the still more vague and general word, *Shin* (a Spirit). The divergence was in a literal sense stereotyped by the action of the great Societies. The British and Foreign Bible Society printed its Bibles using the term *Shang-ti*, the American Bible Society, in some at least of their editions, substituted *Shin*, and the translators of the English Prayer-Book adopted *Tien-Chu* throughout.

In the year 1877 Archbishop Tait's intervention was formally requested. An experienced and trusted Missionary, who had always used the term *Shang-ti*, had been called upon to take part in a series of services under a Bishop, of even larger experience, who, on religious and doctrinal grounds, had a conscientious objection to use that term, and who had himself translated the Prayer Book into Chinese, using the term *Tien-Chu*. Neither of the two felt himself able in conscience to give way, the Bishop regarding the use of *Shang-ti* as "heathenising the

Church instead of Christianising the heathen," while the candidates presented to him for confirmation, and even for ordination,¹ were firmly wedded to the use of that word, its supporters urging that the heathen worship to which the Chinese had been accustomed was rather a distortion of the truth than a contradiction of it, and that *Shang-ti*, the Great Ruler, might under a Christian system be worshipped truly instead of falsely. The complexity and diffuseness of the correspondence which ensued when the Archbishop was appealed to, can be better imagined than described. When controversial theology is introduced as an element in the case, the proverbial sharpness of a philological dispute becomes formidable indeed. One of the letters to the Archbishop consists of 44 closely written pages, another is of 18 pages, and so forth. No one, of course, expected him to solve the purely linguistic problem; but each disputant thought his case might be proved upon general principles, historical and doctrinal, and proceeded to prove it accordingly. The Archbishop gave much time to the subject, and endeavoured to press the advantage of using some common term, either Hebrew, Greek, or English, such, for example, as 'Jehovah' or 'The Lord,' in place of any of the disputed words. But the response to this suggestion was not encouraging, and all he found himself able in the end to do, was to express his own views upon the several theological points which had been raised, to obtain for the disputants the calm opinion of linguistic experts, and to recommend a tolerant and conciliatory attitude upon either side. To quote his letters on the subject would be impossible, without entering into the whole dispute, but, although his efforts were not crowned with any immediate result, it has seemed

¹ An Ordination Service actually took place, in which the Bishop used one term and the candidates, in answering his questions, used another.

right to make this allusion to the matter, partly on account of the time and pains it cost him, and partly as an example of the difficult and varied questions which came at times before him for solution.

A typical instance of a third class of difficulty belonging to the Mission field, and coming frequently before the Archbishop for advice or settlement, is afforded by the Ceylon troubles of 1877-80. The Church Missionary Society had for many years been strongly represented in the island of Ceylon, and some of its missionaries seem to have come to regard themselves as almost exempt from Episcopal control. Bishop Copleston, of Colombo, on the other hand, to whom they owed allegiance, was perhaps less elastic in his rule than some of his predecessors had been. Difficult questions arose about the need and the nature of an Episcopal licence, and the relation of the missionaries to the Bishop was further strained by the missionaries objecting to certain doctrinal expressions and ritual usages to which the Bishop adhered. Matters at last came to a crisis. Several of the missionaries declined to be present at celebrations of the Holy Communion by the Bishop, and he, on the other hand, in a formal letter, declined for the future to license or ordain any member of the Church Missionary Society. For a time it seemed scarcely possible that peace could be restored. The Bishop offered to submit the whole matter to the decision of his immediate Metropolitan, the Bishop of Calcutta. To this the Church Missionary Society would not consent, and they fell back upon a suggestion, made simultaneously but independently by Archbishop Tait and Bishop Copleston, that the subject should be referred "for consideration and advice" to "three or more of the Archbishops and Bishops administering English dioceses, who are Vice-Patrons or Vice-Presidents of the Society." It

was in giving effect to this reference that the Archbishop's experience and skill were most severely tested. The Bishops whose co-operation he invited were the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester.¹ Two of these four colleagues desired immediately to withdraw from the task on learning the indefinite and, as they thought, unbusinesslike character of the reference. Neither party would undertake to abide by the decision at which these Bishops might arrive, and the Bishop of Colombo, who came to England on purpose to explain his position, guarded himself carefully from any formal admission of a right on the Archbishop's part to review or supervise his action.² It had even to be arranged that the meetings of the Committee should be held elsewhere than at Lambeth, lest any colour should be given to the notion that a formal appeal against the Bishop was being officially heard. Notwithstanding these preliminary discouragements, and the consequent despondency of some of his colleagues, the Archbishop resolutely persevered with the inquiry, and a series of meetings of several hours' duration took place, sometimes in the Ecclesiastical Commission offices, sometimes in the Archbishop's room at the House of Lords. The expenditure of time was very great, for the subject was complicated and difficult; and as the Bishop of Colombo thought it undesirable, on the grounds already named, to meet the Society's representatives face to face in the Archbishop's presence, it was necessary to hear each side separately, to the great increase of labour, and sometimes of misunder-

¹ Bishops Jackson, Lightfoot, and Harold Browne.

² The Bishop expressly wished "to keep open, to say the least, the difficult question of the Archbishop's precise jurisdiction." The Metropolitan Bishop of Calcutta takes at consecration an oath of due obedience to the See of Canterbury, and by his Letters-Patent he is "subject to the general superintendence" of the Archbishop.

standing. So serious were these obstacles, that one of the Archbishop's main difficulties throughout the inquiry was to keep his colleagues from giving up their task in despair. The foremost of them argued that it would be better to give no advice or decision than to offer it only for rejection ; the position and authority of the Archbishops would be lowered, and the hopes of peace would be further off than ever.

"I admit the risk," answered the Archbishop, "but I think it is worth running, and I am prepared to spend twice the time and trouble we have already given. We have good men—really good men—to deal with on each side, and it must be in part our fault if we cannot steer their ship through the rocks. At least let us say our say, and throw on them the responsibility if all comes to grief. Pray abide in the ship, and I believe we shall 'win' through."

And he was right. A document was drawn up at last by the Archbishop, and signed by all his colleagues, with a result which may be best described in the words of the controversialists themselves :—

"The Committee of the Church Missionary Society offer their cordial thanks to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to the Prelates associated with him, for the trouble they have taken in preparing the valuable document which they have drawn up on the Ceylon difficulties ; and while gratefully receiving the suggestions therein offered to the Society, they desire to express their conviction that they will be able cheerfully to act upon them."

The Bishop of Colombo to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"BRIGHTON, April 26, 1880.

"MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I have deferred hitherto any formal acknowledgment of the document in which your Grace and the four Prelates associated with you have embodied your advice on the matter about which you allowed me to confer with you ; but before I leave England I desire to express my

gratitude for the attention which your Lordships, amid so many pressing calls upon your time, bestowed upon the question, and for the great kindness which all, and your Grace in particular, have shown to myself.

"It would not become me to comment on your Lordships' conclusions, except in the way which I am sure will please you best, by assuring you that the object which you had in view in all your deliberations has been, by God's blessing, happily attained.

"Since the issue of your Lordships' advice, a long correspondence has taken place between the Committee of the Church Missionary Society and myself, and I have twice had the privilege of meeting their representatives in conference. The result has been that we have arrived at satisfactory terms of agreement, too minute, and in fact too provisional, to be here detailed, but including most of the points touched on by your Lordships, with some others, and bidding fair, in the opinion, I believe, of the Committee, as well as in my own, to secure for the future the harmonious and effective co-operation of the various elements which compose our Church in Ceylon.

"If this be the case, I venture to hope that our troubles of the last few years will not hereafter appear to have been an unmixed evil; they will have contributed something positive towards the solution of those great problems which lie before our Church in her missionary work.

"I hope to leave England in the course of this week, and to reach Colombo before the end of May, and I am happy to feel that I carry with me your Grace's blessing, and shall be speeded by the prayers of many, both among those who on the whole have approved my course hitherto, and also, I trust, among those who have differed from me.—I remain, my dear Lord Archbishop, your obliged and faithful servant in Christ,

"R. S. COLOMBO."

The document of advice which produced this happy result is unsuited for republication here.¹ It was of great length, and discussed in detail such questions as the assignment of districts to missionaries, the nature of the episcopal licence they should hold, and other kindred questions of local organisation, but it touched also upon

¹ It was published in full at the time.

the larger issues involved in such a controversy, and upon the value of the Society's work among the heathen ; and a few of its paragraphs may perhaps be reproduced as characteristic of the care and caution of the Archbishop's utterances.

After an historical account of the origin of the inquiry, the document continues :—

“As soon as we entered on the consideration of the questions at issue, it became apparent to us that a great preliminary difficulty existed, from a conviction having taken possession of the minds of many persons deeply interested in the Church Missionary Society, to the effect that the Bishop of Colombo was, for some reason, so prejudiced against this Society that he had determined to do his best to remove all its missionaries from his diocese.

“We feel certain that this impression is unfounded. Independently of the facts that this Society, which numbers some seventy Bishops of the Church of England amongst its Vice-Presidents, is acknowledged on all hands to be one of the greatest instruments by which our Church spreads the knowledge of Christ among the heathen ; that in the island of Ceylon its agents have been at work for sixty years, beginning at a time long anterior to the establishment of a Bishopric of Colombo ; that it has already spent upon its work in that island no less than £400,000, and has become possessed of many valuable mission buildings ; that about £10,000 is expended annually by the Society for the support of its work in Ceylon amongst some 7000 native Christians connected with its missions, and that, therefore, no Bishop of the Church of England could possibly think of interrupting so great a work carried on by such an agency ; the very circumstance of the Bishop of Colombo having thought it his duty to come from his diocese to England in the hope, as he states, ‘of being able to arrive at conditions under which Licence and Ordination may be granted to the members of the Society,’ precludes the possibility of such an impression being well founded. Moreover, we have had from the Bishop himself a distinct statement that he is actuated by no such motive as has been ascribed to him. . . .

" . . . We do not consider that there is any occasion to inquire whether tests, other than those sanctioned by the Church of England, have in the past been imposed by the Bishop on clergy belonging to the Church Missionary Society, as a qualification for Licence. With respect to these so-called tests there has probably been some misunderstanding, both as to their imposition, and as to the refusal to accept them. If our advice is followed, we believe that there will, for the future, be no ground for such misunderstandings, as we unanimously deprecate the imposition of any such tests. . . .

" . . . A very painful dispute has arisen in consequence of certain of the missionaries having refused to receive the Holy Communion at the Bishop's hands, and from its being understood that they consider themselves bound so to do by some resolution or command of the Church Missionary Society. We are assured that there is some mistake here. The missionaries ought, in our opinion, clearly to understand that they are left perfectly free, by the Society, to follow their own judgment in such matters ; and we cannot but express a strong opinion that, so long as they are required to do nothing which is contrary to the declared law of the Church, they cannot be justified in declining to associate themselves with their Bishop, in the highest act of Christian Worship. . . .

" We find that there is a great divergence of opinion between the Bishop on the one hand and the Society on the other, as to what ought to be the final Constitution of a Church consisting partly of European settlers and partly of native converts from heathenism. The Bishop is strongly of opinion that all races in the island ought to be fused into one organisation, the various native tribes and the Europeans being alike represented in its Conferences or Synods. The Church Missionary Society, on the contrary, is anxious that nothing should interfere with the future complete organisation of a native Church. It is admitted on both sides that this is a most difficult and important question, and one which cannot be hastily settled. It extends far beyond the limits of the diocese or island of Ceylon. The Bishop on the one hand, and the Society on the other, each claim that no step should be taken at present which may seem to prejudge the decision of this question. The Bishop thinks that it is prejudged by the Society forbidding its missionaries to take part in his Diocesan Conference. The Society, on the contrary, thinks it

would be prejudged if their missionaries took part in such a Conference, which would be apt to assume the character of a Legislative Synod. Our advice is that the Bishop should distinctly state that this so-called Synod is at present only a Conference without legislative authority (which we understood is not claimed for it), and that the missionaries should not be forbidden by the Society to take part in such Conference. . . .

“ . . . In conclusion, we need scarcely, we trust, press both upon the Bishop and the Society the extreme gravity of the present condition of affairs. A deep responsibility rests upon both to settle their differences in a conciliatory Christian spirit. Diversities of views on these complicated questions are inevitable, but both parties in this dispute have earnestly at heart the advancement of the Gospel of Christ amongst the heathen; and we feel confident that, in the judgment of the Church at large, both will be held greatly to blame if they do not, as speedily as possible, act in such a manner as will show that they esteem the progress of the Gospel far above the maintenance of their own particular theories as to how the machinery of the Church is to be worked.”

Great as was the labour the Archbishop was ready to bestow on such a question as that which had arisen in Ceylon, he was careful to abstain from taking any part in the public discussion of the subject while it was still *sub judice*. At the annual meeting of the Church Missionary Society in Exeter Hall in 1877 he spoke as follows:—

“ One subject to which you, my Lord, have alluded in your address to-day is a somewhat intricate subject; and if there is no one else in this room—and I don't suppose there is any one else—who is bound to be very cautious in all that he says on this and other intricate subjects in the present day, there certainly is one, and that person is myself. The Act of Parliament and the Letters Patent which constitute the Episcopate in India contain some words which are not over-pleasant for me to read. They are these—that the exercise of the metropolitical power of the Bishopric of Calcutta should be ‘subject to the supervision’ of the Archbishop of Canterbury. What these words may mean I think it will be the business rather of lawyers than of

divines to interpret; but this also I cannot help feeling—and my experience of the last eight years has warned me of it—that whether there be any legal right on the part of the occupant of my position to express opinions on controverted questions which arise in distant parts of our Church, somehow or other all these questions; either in a judicial or semi-judicial way, find their course to Lambeth, and therefore, as a Judge—even if he be only an arbitrator—is a man who ought to be perfectly impartial, you may well excuse me for expressing no opinion whatever on this difficult question.”

Going on to speak of the Society's work generally, he said :—

“We have reason, I think, to be thankful to Almighty God for the progress which this Society has made, and is still making. It is always refreshing to hear the report of this Society—not an imaginary picture of imaginary triumphs, but a real business-like statement of the exact degree of progress which is made year by year—not heeding the discouragements to which we may be exposed, but hopefully stating what they are, and what appear to be the remedies by which they may be surmounted. I am old enough to remember the time when it was a fashionable thing rather to sneer at missionary success and at missionary work. Thank God, I believe that time has greatly gone by. There was a time when our politicians shook their heads gravely when you spoke of any missionary efforts in our distant dependencies. With respect to India especially, it was almost part of a politician's creed that you ought to dissemble your Christianity, and half leave the natives to suppose that you were somewhat ashamed of it. Thank God, that state of things has gone by.”

He was himself, throughout his whole Episcopate, doing everything in his power to promote this growing interest in missionary work. He took the labouring oar in 1872 in the establishment of an Annual Day of Intercession for Foreign Missions, and a somewhat contemptuous leading article in the *Times* upon the subject evoked from him the following private letter to Mr. Delane :—

“ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
Dec. 21, 1872.

“MY DEAR MR. DELANE,—Will you allow me to call your attention to a leading article in the *Times* of to-day on yesterday's Missionary Services? I think it possible you may be willing to set the author of the article right as to the view of Church of England missions which he has taken. It is a great mistake to represent the Church of England as falling behind all other bodies in this respect. The statistics are accessible, and could easily be placed in any one's hands. I think young men are not so cautious or wise in dealing with subjects of this kind, on which there is a strong feeling in the well-disposed classes of society, as the sounder heads were which used to guide us formerly. If I had any influence, I would take care to keep such subjects for old hands, and let the rising ability exercise itself in matters on which the public does not feel so keenly as in the present age it does on all ecclesiastical and religious questions. My fear for the world is, that in this generation, through the vast influence of the press, we may be governed by boys, and those not wise ones,—an end to be especially deplored in a day when boys are proverbially more rash and headstrong than they used to be, and when, after all, there are plenty of wise old heads to keep them right if they will be guided.

“Pray excuse this, called forth by feeling the great influence which you exercise over the writing and reading public, and treat it as entirely confidential. I may be mistaken as to the authorship, but I know you will not take amiss this expression of my feeling, jealous as I am for the influence of the press as well as of the Church, and knowing as I do how very much the writers of such articles have in their power.—Yours very sincerely,

“A. C. CANTUAR.”

The extent and variety of the Archbishop's foreign correspondence may perhaps be illustrated by the transcription of a few consecutive headings from one of the ordinary ‘foreign columns’ of the register in which his letters of each year were catalogued for reference. Some of the single bundles thus docketed contain perhaps twenty or thirty letters, and the period comprised is of course a portion of one year only.

<i>Antigua,</i>	.	.	.	{ Letters about diocesan details. Important.
<i>Antioch, Patriarch of,</i>	.	.	.	{ Correspondence with Foreign Office, etc.
<i>Armenians,</i>	.	.	.	{ Armenian laymen on the condition of their countrymen.
<i>Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople,</i>	.	.	.	{ Letter to the Abp. about his Schools.
<i>Assyrian Christians,</i>	.	.	.	{ Correspondence with S.P.G., etc., respecting.
<i>Barbados,</i>	.	.	.	Advice upon a difficulty in diocese.
<i>Blomfontein,</i>	.	.	.	The Bishop's Mission to Basutoland.
<i>Calcutta, Bishop of,</i>	.	.	.	{ Letters on the meetings of the Indian Bishops.
<i>Capetown,</i>	.	.	.	On the diocese of Pretoria.
<i>Chaldeans,</i>	.	.	.	{ Letter from Abp. to members of Syro-Chaldaic Church.
<i>Christ Church, New Zealand,</i>	.	.	.	{ Letters from the Bishop.
<i>Colombo,</i>
<i>Gibraltar, Bishop of,</i>	.	.	.	{ Difficulties about Continental Chaplaincies.
<i>Grahamstown, Bishop of,</i>	.	.	.	On the Colenso schism.
<i>Honolulu,</i>	.	.	.	Letters on the Endowment of the See.
<i>Japan,</i>	.	.	.	Relation of English Bishops to.
<i>Jerusalem, Bishop and Others,</i>	.	.	.	{ Controversy about —.
<i>Montreal,</i>	.	.	.	Proposed division of the diocese.
<i>Moosonee,</i>	.	.	.	Letters from the Bishop.
<i>Moravians,</i>	.	.	.	Inquiry <i>in re</i> Moravian Episcopate.
<i>Morocco,</i>	.	.	.	Persecution of Christians by the Jews.
<i>Nestorians of Oroomiah,</i>	.	.	.	Mar Shimoom.
<i>Do.,</i>	.	.	.	Emissary to England.
<i>Niger,</i>	.	.	.	Extent of Mission.
<i>Pittsburgh, Bishop of,</i>	.	.	.	On Emigrants.
<i>Punjab,</i>	.	.	.	Petition of Native Church.
Etc.	.	.	.	Etc. Etc.

It will be understood that the foregoing is merely a specimen column, selected almost at random, and not different in character or extent from those of other years.

The arrangement followed in this chapter has been one of subjects rather than of dates, and some of the events which have been alluded to were subsequent to the 'Second Lambeth Conference' of 1878. It will be appropriate, in this connection, to give some account of that gathering, and especially of the Archbishop's share in its inception and management. It will be remembered that at the 'First Conference,' which met under Archbishop Longley in 1867, any quiet consideration of general questions was rendered almost impossible by the keen personal interest and even excitement of the strife about Bishop Colenso and his deposition. Great subjects had indeed been mooted and referred to committees, but by the time the committees were able to report, the American and Colonial Bishops had most of them left England, and it was impossible for the handful of men who met for a few hours on a single day to do more than formally receive the reports, and commend them to the consideration of the Church. So heated, too, had been the atmosphere of the Conference debates, that it was felt by many to be more than doubtful whether it would ever be wise to repeat the experiment of such a Conference.

The Bishops who had been most active in promoting the Conference belonged, speaking generally, to the party of which Bishop Gray and Bishop Wilberforce had been the foremost representatives; and when Bishop Tait, who had in 1867 stood so prominently upon the other side, was, a year later, appointed to the Primacy, they felt perhaps less enthusiasm than before for the assembling of a second Conference over which he must necessarily preside. Bishop Selwyn, however, in England, and Bishop Kerfoot in the United States, were unflagging in their efforts for a second gathering. They were warmly supported by the Canadian Bishops, and in 1874 Bishop

Selwyn attended the General Convention of the Church of the United States, and gave the weight of his authority and assistance to Bishop Kerfoot and his friends, who had not a little opposition to contend with among the American Bishops, many of whom were openly distrustful of the proposed Conference and its management.¹

Once again, as in 1867, it was the wish of some of those who were ready to attend such a Conference, that, if it were to assemble at all, the occasion should be utilised for a formal and authoritative statement of the doctrine of the Church of England on certain controverted points (such, for example, as the nature and limits of Inspiration), and the Archbishop was compelled to make it clear from the first that such was not his intention. A few extracts from the voluminous correspondence which ensued will serve to make the outcome clear.

*Bishop Kerfoot of Pittsburgh to the Archbishop of
Canterbury.*

“HOUSE OF BISHOPS, NEW YORK,
Nov. 3, 1874.

“MY DEAR LORD,—I had the pleasure not long since of writing to you from this House, to say that the request to your Grace to invite another Lambeth Conference had been signed by forty-three out of forty-six Bishops in attendance. I then said that I would write again fully when the engagements of the General Convention allowed me to do so. The matter was introduced by me into this House early in our session, so that the Lord Bishop of Lichfield, who was with us for the first week of the Convention, might speak to the Bishops on the subject. He did this with great discretion and effect in our House, and also in the House of Deputies. While the Bishops generally were very favourably disposed towards the proposal (and your Grace's

¹ This was owing mainly to the recently published Biography of Bishop Hopkins of Vermont, in which the Conference of 1867, and Bishop Tait's action in particular, had been held up to unmeasured opprobrium.

note to me of August 25th very much promoted this inclination), some of them wished that any action of the Bishops should be preceded by some expression from the clerical and lay deputies that would prevent any thought that the Bishops were acting for themselves alone, and not also for and with the clergy and laity. . . . It clearly appeared in the consultations of the deputies, and even of the Bishops, that there were not a few misconceptions about the Conference of 1867. This, I think, was due, in large measure, to the misrepresentation of its character and management in the Memoir of the late Bishop Hopkins. . . . Bishop Hopkins himself would not, I am sure, have approved of the sketch of the Lambeth Conference given by his biographer. But its effects were seen, and I hope counteracted, in the discussions.

"In the consultation of the Bishops, the wish was several times expressed that the arrangements for a Conference in 1876 should be such as to manifest that the variety of the topics admitted, and the time allowed, should be such as would seem to justify a Convocation of our Bishops from all over the world. There was no wish to annex terms or conditions to our request to your Grace. The suggestions already made by the Canadian Synod (whose action on this subject was recited in our House of Bishops) covers most or all of this ground. As our consultations went on, it seemed to be devolved on me, by general consent, to make to you this informal communication about such wishes. . . . I made answers to the inquiries of some of my brethren [about the Conference of 1867] adding that, of course, as then, so whenever we should meet again, no topic should be introduced which must elicit discussions on the State relations of the Church of England. All the Bishops here at once recognise this as the right rule. I said this was the only real limitation I witnessed seven years ago. I ventured to anticipate that on this point every reasonable wish would be satisfied in the future Conference.

"In thus writing at, I hope, not a needless length to your Grace, I think that I quite fulfil the promises made to some of my American brethren, who united heartily in the request sent to you, and I hope that I also convey such intimations as will entirely meet your own views in your anticipation of any such Conference. I may also add that the careful consideration given to the whole scheme here of late only confirms our con-

victions of the wisdom and usefulness of the renewal of the Conference of 1867.—I am, my dear Lord Archbishop, your Grace's very faithful and affectionate brother,

“JOHN B. KERFOOT, Bishop of Pittsburgh.”

In reply to the formal letter of the American Bishops the Archbishop wrote as follows:—

“LAMBETH PALACE, *June 7, 1875.*

“RIGHT REV. AND DEAR BRETHREN,—I have laid before my brethren of the Province of Canterbury your letter on the subject of holding a second Lambeth Conference, and I have had communication on the same subject with the Archbishop of York, as representing the Bishops of the Northern Province. We entertain a grateful sense of the advantages of that brotherly intercourse which the last Lambeth Conference tended to encourage, and we should look forward with much pleasure to another meeting of the same kind. . . . It seems to my brethren and myself that such a Conference could not with advantage be held till the tenth year after the last meeting. . . .

“I have also been requested to bring before you the following point. You will at once see that I ought not to take the step of inviting so large a body of bishops to leave the scene of their labours in their distant dioceses without being able to state to them somewhat explicitly what the practical results are which are expected to be derived from the Conference.

“It appears to us that, respecting matters of doctrine, no change can be proposed or discussed, and that no authoritative explanation of doctrine ought to be taken in hand. Each Church is naturally guided in the interpretation of its formularies by its recognised authorities. Again, respecting matters of discipline, each Church has its own appointed courts for the administration of its ecclesiastical law, with which, of course, such a meeting of Bishops as is proposed claims no power to interfere. The present state of the Christian Church makes men more than usually sensitive as to any appearance even of a claim on the part of any one branch of the Church to interfere with the decisions or administration of another. Each is considered qualified to regulate its own separate affairs, while all are united in the maintenance of the one faith. Therefore, if the Conference meets, it

will be necessary to exclude all questions which might happen to trench on the complete independence of the several branches of the Church. The propriety of the Bishops meeting in Conference must depend, I conceive, upon this—whether there appear a sufficient number of subjects relating to the brotherly intercourse of the various branches of the Anglican Communion, on which a conference of the chief ministers of the several Churches would be likely to throw light.

“I should be greatly obliged for any communication which you may be disposed to send to me during the next six months, as to your views on the general desirableness of our meeting under such circumstances as I have described. I will take care, before the close of the present year, to lay before my brethren in England any statement I receive as to the particular questions which you think it desirable for the Bishops of the Anglican Communion to consider. This would enable us to come to a decision respecting the Conference, and make any arrangements that may be required.—I remain your faithful brother and servant in Christ,

A. C. CANTUAR.”

He had already spoken in Convocation to the like effect, and his words are important as laying down the basis which has since been carefully observed.

“It must be remembered,” he said, “that it is a serious matter to gather the Bishops together from all parts of the globe, unless there is some distinct object for their so gathering. I therefore am disposed, by the advice of my brethren, to request that our brethren at home, and also those at a distance, will state to me as explicitly as possible what the objects are that it is desirable to discuss at such meeting. They are of a somewhat limited character. There is no intention whatever on the part of anybody to gather together the Bishops of the Anglican Church for the sake of defining any matter of doctrine. Our doctrines are contained in our formularies, and our formularies are interpreted by the proper judicial authorities, and there is no intention whatever at any such gathering that questions of doctrine should be submitted for interpretation. My predecessor had a very difficult task in defining the exact duty of the Bishops who came together on the former occasion, and with

great firmness, and at the same time with that remarkable courtesy and kindness for which he was so eminent, he steered the somewhat difficult course which was before him, and it was distinctly settled that matters of that kind were not to be entered upon. Well, then, with regard to discipline, of course our discipline is exercised by ourselves and by the constituted Courts of the Church at home, and the discipline of the various Colonial and more independent Churches is exercised by these Churches according to fixed rules which have been established by themselves, and we have no intention whatever of interfering with these matters of discipline. . . . I cannot doubt that there are many points respecting the connection between the mother Church and the Colonial Churches on which a friendly conference would be very valuable indeed. The Colonial Church is at present in an unsettled and somewhat difficult position. You are aware that generally letters-patent have been withdrawn in the Colonial Churches, and thereby their jurisdiction over their clergy has been somewhat unsettled, and their right to property which was intended for the See has itself been put in a precarious position. . . . With regard to our brethren in America no such difficulties exist, and what we enjoyed so much during the late Conference was the friendly intercourse and interchange of sentiment between us and them. We have no desire to interfere with their affairs, and I am sure that they have no desire to interfere with ours. I think, as far as they are concerned, it would be a work of love in which we should be engaged—namely, the extension of Christ's kingdom, and in that, perhaps, we may be able by friendly intercourse to strengthen each other's hands. Of course there is also this point, that in various parts of our extensive colonies there are branches of the American Church extending themselves, and the sort of relations that ought to exist between the clergy of our Church and the clergy of that Church, which has its branches even in China, might form a subject for consideration. But I think it important that we should have the thing, if possible, distinctly stated; that there should be no misunderstanding, and none of that difficulty, which, I am bound to say, did exist at the last Lambeth Conference, as to what subjects might and what subjects might not be introduced; that we should know what it is that our brethren wish to bring before us, and what we wish to bring before them, before they give themselves the trouble of coming from the ends

of the earth, happy as the results of such a meeting under God's providence are likely to be."¹

Fortified by the concurrence of the Northern Convocation, which had held aloof in 1867, the Archbishop of Canterbury issued a formal letter on March 28, 1876, to all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, intimating his readiness to hold a Conference in 1878, "if it shall seem expedient, after the opinions of all our brethren have been ascertained," and inviting an expression of opinion. Before the close of the year about ninety letters of reply were received by the Archbishop from all parts of the world, showing, as had been anticipated, an overwhelming preponderance of opinion in favour of a second Conference, provided a longer period of session could be arranged for than "the four short days" of 1867. Most of the Bishops also suggested subjects for discussion, and on these the Archbishop took counsel with an Episcopal Committee, and especially with Bishop Selwyn. After the fullest deliberation, the following definite invitation was issued:—

"LAMBETH PALACE, *July 10, 1877.*

"RIGHT REVEREND AND DEAR BROTHER,—It is proposed to hold a Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion, at this place, beginning on Tuesday, the 2d day of July 1878.

"The Conference, it is proposed, shall extend over four weeks; the first week, of four sessions, to be devoted to discussions, in Conference, of the subjects submitted for deliberation; the second and third weeks to the consideration of these subjects in Committees; and the fourth week to final discussions in Conference, and to the close of the meeting.

"The subjects selected for discussion are the following—

"1. The best mode of maintaining union among the various churches of the Anglican Communion.

"2. Voluntary Boards of Arbitration for Churches to which such an arrangement may be applicable.

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, April 16, 1875, pp. 132-135.

"3. The relations to each other of Missionary Bishops and of Missionaries, in various branches of the Anglican Communion, acting in the same country.

"4. The position of Anglican Chaplains and Chaplaincies on the continent of Europe and elsewhere.

"5. Modern forms of infidelity, and the best means of dealing with them.

"6. The condition, progress, and needs of the various Churches of the Anglican Communion.

"I shall feel greatly obliged if, at your early convenience, you will inform me whether we may have the pleasure of expecting your presence at the Conference.—I am, right reverend and dear brother, Yours faithfully in Christ,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

One hundred and eight Bishops accepted the Archbishop's invitation. Some of these, however, were at the last moment prevented from attending, and the actual number present at the Conference was exactly one hundred.

The Archbishop's Diary, quoted in the last chapter, has made reference to the muster of the Bishops in Canterbury Cathedral on St. Peter's Day, 1878, and to the address which he delivered from St. Augustine's Chair, under circumstances of extraordinary strain and trial.¹

"My brothers," he said, "representatives of the Church throughout the world, engaged in spreading the Gospel of Jesus Christ wherever the sun shines, I esteem it a very high privilege to welcome you here to-day, to the cradle of Anglo-Saxon Christianity. . . . I am addressing you from St. Augustine's Chair. This thought carries us back to the time when the first missionary to our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, amid much discouragement, landed on these barbarous shores. More than twelve centuries and a half have rolled on since then. The seed he sowed has borne an abundant harvest, and this great British nation, and our sister beyond the ocean, have cause to render thanks to

¹ See above, p. 329.

God for the work begun by him here. And how full of encouragement to you is St. Augustine's work! What difficulties greater than those that confronted him can stand in your path? And you have blessings that he had not. You stand nearer the pure primitive Christianity of the Apostles. You have a motive power to touch the heart denied to him. . . . The varied history of the Church has recorded many failures and many successes and we learn from the past neither to be elated by the one nor discouraged by the other. The monuments which surround us speak of a chequered history. They tell of dark times and of great times. But they all testify to the superintending power of God, Who works all things according to the pleasure of His will, after His own plan for the building up of His one kingdom in His own way. . . . It is my privilege to welcome you to Christ Church, Canterbury. . . . Gregory sent St. Augustine here that he might mark England with the name of Christ, 'that Name which is above every name.' God grant that that name may be ever more and more acknowledged among us; that its glories may shine more and more brightly here, and in your distant dioceses, triumphing over all obstacles, and reconciling all petty divisions, uniting all hearts in the truth of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ. My brethren from across the Atlantic—you especially from the great Republic—to you a particular welcome is due from me. Partly for our Church's sake, partly for my sake, partly also for something you discerned in himself, you welcomed one very dear to me last autumn.¹ The bond that unites us is not the less sacred because so many hopes of earthly joy have withered and disappeared. God unite us all more closely in His own great family! And now let us fall to prayer."

Three days later the Conference met for the despatch of business in the Great Library—Juxon's Hall—at Lambeth. The results of its deliberations have been repeatedly made public, and are accessible to every one.² The debates, however, were not published, and it may be

¹ The Rev. Craufurd Tait had been formally welcomed by the House of Bishops assembled at Boston, on Oct. 5, 1877.

² For a full account of the whole Conference and its official utterances see *The Origin and History of the Lambeth Conferences*, S.P.C.K., 1889, pp. 20-34, 139-221.

interesting to reproduce a few characteristic paragraphs from the shorthand report of the Archbishop's opening speech :—

“What is it,” he said, “that has brought us here together this day? We are not representatives, in any strict sense, of the various Churches from which we come. A plenipotentiary coming from any great community has, I suppose, a delegation from that community to act distinctly in its name, and by whatever a plenipotentiary decides his nation must be more or less bound. We are not plenipotentiaries, but still we are here in a certain sense as representatives. For a hundred Bishops from all parts of the earth, representing Churches with very different constitutions, and very different difficulties to contend with, may fairly be supposed to bring to this room a representative knowledge of what needs to be communicated to these various Churches, although the governing bodies of those various Churches must each by themselves decide as to how much they will adopt of the suggestions which we make to them, and how much they will reject. We have no power to bind anybody, and we do not desire to have it. We desire to hold mutual conference one with another, and set forth our opinions after full and fair discussion, and to make such suggestions as we believe to be expedient, leaving to the various branches of the Church Catholic to accept or reject whatever suggestions we make to them. I think it is important that we should for a moment consider how diverse are the forms of government of the various bodies which are more or less represented in this room. First we have our own time-honoured Constitution, a plain and simple Constitution—which has stood the test of at least three hundred years. When we speak of the government of a Church, we speak of two things—its legislative and its judicial powers. In our Church of England there is no mistake as to either our legislative or our judicial powers. Our legislative powers were plainly defined at the time of the Reformation. The Sovereign of the Realm has claimed for himself—and, in my estimation at least, has justly claimed—that this National Church shall not be dependent upon any foreign power—that no power either within or without, be it ecclesiastical, or be it what it may, shall set at naught the decision of that great civil power which God has established and

sanctioned from the first. Therefore it is distinctly laid down in that great statute, on which the Church of England in its relation to the State has embodied its constitution, that no change shall be proposed in any matter by the Church of England in its synod unless the civil power, in the person of the Sovereign, shall first have said that it is right that the matter should be taken into consideration. When that leave is granted, the Synods of the Church of England proceed to deliberate on the matter in hand. A canon is formed, and that canon has binding force, when, having been referred again to the Civil Power, the Sovereign of the Realm has stated that there is no objection to the canon which has been framed. What! you will say, the Sovereign interfering in a matter ecclesiastical? Thank God, in this country it is the theory that the Sovereign, as representing the Civil Power, is intimately connected with the Church of Christ established in these realms. The Synods of the Church may be convoked, but they must be convoked with the consent of the Civil Power, and being so convoked they may proceed to legislate and form canons. The Church of England thinks this a very important matter. It not only sees with regard to its own Church, but it sees with regard to all Churches, that no Church is entitled to set itself up against the Ordinance of God as embodied in the Civil Power. No general Council can be called together—and this is embodied in one of the Articles to which we are all pledged—except by the will and command of princes. I am not saying that you are to adopt this in America, but I am saying that this is the Constitution of the Church of England. We are bound by it, and we have found that upon the whole it has not worked badly; and we consider that it has this great advantage, that in a plain practical way it proclaims to the whole world that we consider that kings are the ministers of God—that the Civil Power is a delegation from Him, and that the laity, who are entitled and admitted in every well-ordered community to a voice in matters ecclesiastical, are fairly and well represented according to our Constitution by the influence of the Civil Power. Now, in the course of the changing ages difficulties will arise as to this as well as with regard to a thousand other matters. But such is the legislative constitution of the Church of England, and at present I see no symptom of its being changed until something better is found. Then, as to our judicial system, what is its peculiarity? It is

this—that whereas in some other countries the judicial system of the Church exists merely by voluntary contract, and therefore there is no constraining power anywhere to oblige any man to obey the decisions of the various Courts of the Church, by that union of Church and State which exists in our own constitution, our Ecclesiastical Courts are constituted Courts of the Realm, and their decisions are therefore binding, just as the decisions of any other Courts of the realm are—a special characteristic of an Established Church. We understand then what is our constitution at home; but we have great varieties of constitution at a distance from ourselves. We have our brethren from India, the most distinctly Established Church in the world, paid by the State, by a grant from year to year, its revenues depending not on old prescriptive usages, as is the case with the Church at home, but on grants which are made distinctly by Parliament; and, as all persons who are acquainted with India know, the British rule in India being more or less that of a conquering race in the midst of a conquered, the modes of proceeding there are far more summary as to the interference of the Civil Power than they are at home. For example, unless I am misinformed, an Indian bishop cannot leave India without the consent of the Governor-General. This is a form of an Established Church different from the Church at home, because more entirely and completely the servant of the State. I do not know that that is a good state of things. Perhaps some of our brethren from India are come to propose that there should be some alteration; but at all events, that is what it is at present. Then, when we pass to our Churches in the Colonies, these are of such various kinds, that I believe there are not more than three persons in England who can give you a definite idea of what the constitution of a Colonial Church is. I rather pride myself on being one of the three, and perhaps, though I do not wish to enter into tedious details, I may very briefly state to you what are the different conditions of the different Colonial Churches at the present moment. . . . I shall not undertake to explain, in the same detail, what is the system of our brethren of the United States of America. They will explain it no doubt more fully and clearly than I can; but they also have such Synods as I have described, consisting partly of clergy and partly also of laity. Well then, it is plain, I think, that we who are assembled here represent bodies which have very different constitutions; and

whatever advice we may give in our deliberations in this assembly must go back, before it can have any binding or practical force, to those bodies who are perfectly independent, and perfectly competent to act for themselves. At the same time I doubt not that they will receive, as they ought to receive, with great attention and respect any advice or decision which we may arrive at as desirable to communicate through you, when you return to your individual Churches. And now we are to proceed to consider some of the matters upon which we ought to give this advice. Shall I be supposed to trespass too much upon your time if I venture to enunciate one or two principles which occur to my own mind as not undesirable to carry with us in the consideration of the questions that have to come before us? Some people think there is a danger in the present day lest Churches should occupy themselves too much with minor matters. After all, it is the spread of the Eternal Gospel of Jesus Christ that we all have at heart. There may be many ways of spreading it, and it will not do to be too nice as to the machinery, provided the result which that machinery has to produce can be gained. Small matters with reference to minute details of constitution and arrangement, I think, if we are wise, we shall keep clear of, and try to direct our thoughts to the great question of spreading the Gospel of Jesus Christ. The very diversity of our constitutions, the very differences of climate and of civil government in the countries from which we come, remind us that we must be prepared for diversity in the midst of essential union. Outside the church, we must be prepared to be tolerant even though we do not receive toleration in return. This sort of toleration for which I plead is a Christian virtue, and it is not less for us a Christian virtue because other men choose to ignore it. If, therefore, those who are without our Church are intolerant of us, I hope we shall never so far follow their example as to be intolerant of them. And, a National Church too, like ours—a church which desires to mould and influence a nation—must also be tolerant of diversities of opinion within. This toleration is the same as Catholicity. Sects are narrow and intolerant. The Catholic Church of Christ is wide and knows no intolerance. It dwells—and the more we study its history, the more shall we be struck by finding that it dwells—on the essentials of the Christian faith.

How often, when a controversy arises, men have supposed that the Catholic Church of old has decided it in some narrow sense,

and yet when they look for the decision they find that there has been none! Not in ceremonies, not in phrases, but deep down in the Christian heart lie those verities by which Christians live, and which comfort Christians when they die—these are the Christian verities, and for these the Catholic Church contends. Brethren, we want no new gospel, but we want the old one more distinctly and clearly proclaimed in its entirety. We do not want to be glorifying the last forty years of the Church of England's history to the disparagement of other times, neither do we want to go back for the disparagement of our times to the Fathers of the Evangelical revival. We do not want to go back to the Caroline Divines as if they embodied all the wisdom of the Church of England, nor to those who went before them. Nay, we do not go back, for final guidance, even to the undivided Church, not even to the Church of the first three centuries. We desire to be guided by our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ, and His recorded Word, and the words of His Apostles. Here we build our faith: and we believe that in the changing ages, this everlasting Gospel will become more and more adapted to the ever-changing circumstances of the human race which it was destined in all its varieties to save. In the sermon which we heard to-day, it was mentioned that many who were here at our last gathering had gone to their rest. I will not speak of any excepting him who held my place at that time. All of you of the small remnant, for it is after all but small, who were, eleven years ago, present here, will remember the kindly, gentle, Christian influence which proceeded from this Chair, and which, among many difficulties, regulated all we did: many besides him have gone to their rest: amongst them one to whom more than any other we owe it that we are assembled in this room. But what I wish to say is this: that from the place of that rest those men, I am sure, now desire that we should be exercised, not with any passing questions which shall minister to strife, but with the best mode of extending the Gospel of Christ to which their lives were devoted. Whatever were their diversities of character, or whatever insignificant matters for a time occupied their attention here, now in the presence of God they have to deal with realities, and they desire that we should deal with them too. . . ."

Throughout the month, the Archbishop took an active part in the whole deliberations of the Conference. Besides

the general debates, he presided in person at every meeting of what was perhaps the most important of its Committees, and, with the help of Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln, Bishop Fraser of Manchester, Bishop Mitchinson of Barbados, and others, he drew up those portions of the Report which dealt with such difficult and various questions as the attitude of the Church of England towards Rome, and towards the Old Catholic movement; the constitution of the West Indian Dioceses; and the home troubles about Ritual and the Confessional. Never in his long Episcopate did he work harder, never probably with happier results. When the Conference came to an end, there was one combined chorus of satisfaction and thankfulness in describing the part he had borne in its labours. A large proportion of the Bishops gave some account of the Conference in their diocesan Charges or elsewhere, and the tribute borne to the Archbishop's chairmanship was as emphatic as it was unanimous. A single specimen extract may suffice. It is the testimony of an American Bishop who had singular opportunities and qualifications for forming an opinion upon such a point :—

“First and foremost in rank, as he was unquestionably in his presence and ‘manysidedness’ of character, was the Primate of all England, Dr. Archibald Campbell Tait. . . . As the host of a hundred Bishops who recognised in him, if not a patriarchal dignity, a pre-eminence willingly and reverently accorded to the incumbent of the chair of St. Austin of Canterbury, his evident sympathy with the toils and trials, the prejudices and prepossessions, the varying experiences and processes of thought, of his brethren from all over the earth, won a universal admiration not unmingled with love. . . . Fair and equitable in his address and rulings, and at the same time astute in feeling the temper of his auditors and brethren, and singularly adroit in the management of one of the most independent and unimpressible gatherings possible to conceive, the Archbishop's presidency was above praise. While avoiding all appearance of dictation, his presence and position were always

felt; and the harmony and unanimity of the Conference were largely due to his uniform affability and good temper, and his masterly leadership. . . . He impressed us profoundly with his eminent fitness for the trying though dignified position he has been chosen of God to fill."¹

¹ *The Second Lambeth Conference*, by the Bishop of Iowa, p. 31.

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE BURIALS CONTROVERSY.

1877-1880.

IT has already been pointed out how many were the occasions during the life of Archbishop Tait when he was compelled either to be untrue to his conscientious convictions or to stand in opposition to the mass of the clergy of the Church of England.

Alike on the University Commission of 1850, in the *Essays and Reviews* controversy of 1862, and in the Colenso strifes of 1865, he had borne the combined criticism, and even onslaught, of Evangelicals and High Churchmen. And now, as his life was drawing to a close, he found himself opposed to a clerical phalanx even more unanimous, if the evidence of signatures be reliable, than any which had confronted him in earlier years. However it be explained, it is a fact, and a significant one, that on no subject have so large a number of signatures ever been collected from the clergy of England as were arrayed in opposition to the Government Burials Bill of 1880.

On this, if on no other ground, the story of the controversy must briefly be told. It is impossible to understand the Archbishop's share in its closing scenes without a recollection of what had gone before. The question was one which had been constantly before Parliament for just twenty years. On February 19, 1861, Sir Morton Peto, as spokesman of the Nonconformists in the House of

Commons, obtained leave to introduce a Bill upon the subject. To any one who reads the important debate,¹ which ended in the rejection of that measure, it will be evident that the proposal had not yet aroused in the minds of Churchmen the indignation and acrimony which it inspired in after years. But its re-introduction session after session fanned the flame on either side, and a compromise, which had at first seemed on the point of general acceptance,² became less and less possible as time went on.

In long-lived controversies—especially those which turn on things ecclesiastical—the position of the contending parties is usually found to be a shifting one. Tarquin and the Sibyl are standing types of controversialists, whether the dispute be about Education, or Local Option, or Ritualism, or the Confessional, or a score of other things.

The question of the burial of Nonconformists in English churchyards is, perhaps, in some measure, an exception to this rule. The Legislative Act of 1880 differed less than might have been expected from the proposals made in 1861, and the conservative Churchmen who bewailed the 'Capitulation' of the Bishops, in 1880, did but repeat, in almost identical words, the speeches they had themselves delivered under happier auspices twenty years before.³ Sir Morton Peto was a man of wealth and influence, and a prominent office-bearer in the Baptist denomination. He had personal, as well as political, grounds for feeling strongly on the subject, owing to circumstances of a painful kind connected with

¹ *Hansard*, April 24, 1861, pp. 1021-1051.

² On the report of a Select Committee in 1862.

³ Lord Beaconsfield, Lord Salisbury, Lord Cranbrook, and Sir John Mowbray, *mutatis nominibus*, together with Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Hubbard, and Mr. Newdegate, were in the forefront of opposition to the Bill, both in 1861 and 1880.

the funeral of a member of his family. By the provision of his Bill, "any person, not being a clergyman," was to be empowered, at the request of the friends of the deceased, to conduct in the churchyard such service as might be desired, convenient notice having been in each case duly given to the minister of the parish.

Year after year he introduced his Bill without success, and on his leaving Parliament, in 1868, the task was carried on with a like enthusiasm by Mr. Osborne Morgan, who was ultimately, when Judge Advocate-General in Mr. Gladstone's Government, to steer the measure safely through the House of Commons. To that arena the full scheme was, in its earlier years, confined. In moving the rejection of the Bill, when first proposed for second reading, Sir William Heathcote¹ rested the principal argument of his striking speech upon the inflexible rubrics of the Burial Service, which applied as sternly to the unbaptized child of a Churchman as to any Nonconformist in the land.

"The alleged grievance," he said, "is not that Nonconformists are, as such, excluded from the Burial Service of the Church, to which it is notorious that they are continually admitted, but that among Nonconformists, the small number who cannot satisfy these rules, to which Churchmen themselves are bound to submit in this matter, are excluded by force of these rules, as are Churchmen also who fail to satisfy them."

The supporters of the Bill had the obvious reply that it was not their wish that such a grievance should continue, either for Churchmen or for Nonconformists,—they were ready to give even-handed relief all round ; and they took pains to add, on every occasion, that they agreed with many Churchmen in thinking it intolerable that the clergy should be compelled by law to read one service

¹ M.P. for the University of Oxford.

over good and bad alike. In accordance with this view, Lord Ebury, as a reforming Churchman, brought the whole subject under the unwilling notice of the House of Lords. In four successive years¹ he appealed for the appointment of a Royal Commission "to consider what steps should be taken to obviate the evil complained of as arising from the present compulsory and indiscriminate use of the Burial Service of the Church of England." His arguments turned mainly on the difficulties which beset the clergy in having to read such a service over those whose lives had been notoriously evil. On this point a petition, signed by about 4000 clergy, had been presented to the Bishops in 1853, and had met with a most discouraging reply.²

Armed with such a text, and with several anecdotes to give it point, Lord Ebury forced the subject indefatigably upon the attention of the House. Archbishop Longley, after asking for a year's delay, that he might consult his brethren, met the appeal with a practical *non possumus*. Bishop Tait, to the Archbishop's strongly expressed disappointment, took the opposite view, and thought that some measure of relief might be accorded. The House of Lords agreed with the Archbishop; but³ the debates had the practical result of contributing to the appointment of the Ritual Commission, which was nominated in 1867, to consider not merely (as at first suggested)⁴ the Lectionary and the Burial Service, but the whole Rubrics and Ritual of the Church of England. The question, thus merged in a larger one, was allowed to slumber for a time: but only for a time. Its usefulness as a political weapon had now

¹ 1863-4-5-6.

² The whole story of this petition, and of the scandals which had led to it, was told by Lord Ebury in the House of Lords on June 1, 1863 (*Hansard*, p. 154), and with further details on July 3, 1865 (*Hansard*, p. 1030).

³ Motion by Lord Ebury on June 11, 1866 (*Hansard*, p. 95).

become abundantly clear, and but for the absorbing Irish Church battle of 1868-69, a Burials Bill would undoubtedly have come sooner to the front. With these larger issues provided to their hand, it was a wise economy on the part of the Liberal leaders to keep the Burials question in the background. Mr. Osborne Morgan, however, as a private member, re-introduced his measure year after year, and carried its second reading by large majorities in no less than four successive sessions.¹ At the general election of 1874 the Liberal candidates throughout the country were so ready to pledge themselves in favour of the measure, that it became what would now be described as 'a plank in the Liberal platform.' The sweeping victory of Mr. Disraeli left on the shoulders of the Conservatives the responsibility of dealing, if they could, with a question which had now become so formidable. Already they had broached the subject in the House of Lords. Lord Beauchamp had twice carried through that House a Bill of a few short clauses, providing for the interment in consecrated ground, without any service whatever, of those for whom such a funeral should be claimed. The proposal, however harmless and well intended, was resented rather than welcomed by those whom it was intended to pacify, and Archbishop Tait, although he would not vote against it, was unable to regard it as a solution of the problem. These efforts, such as they were, had been made while the Conservatives were in opposition. They were now in power; and even from the merest political point of view, it was their interest to deprive their opponents, if possible, of so valuable a weapon of offence. So soon, however, as it was known that the Government had a Bill in preparation, Lord Granville, on behalf of the Liberal party, introduced, in the form of a lengthy resolution in favour of

¹ On March 23, 1870; majority 111. On March 1, 1871; majority 62. On February 14, 1872; majority 71. On March 26, 1873; majority 63.

allowing a Nonconformist service by the grave, the very proposals which the Conservatives had so consistently opposed. It was the first occasion on which the subject was adequately debated in the House of Lords, and Archbishop Tait's speech was awaited with much interest. In his view, the question had now become a mere political stalking-horse, and he set himself with all his might, both in this speech and in his private correspondence on the subject, to remove it from the arena of partisan strife into a higher and purer atmosphere. A few paragraphs of his speech may perhaps be quoted as an example of his manner of appealing to the "Christian common-sense" of England rather than to Churchmen only:—

"Nothing," he said,¹ "can be more undesirable than that a question of this kind, which touches men in the tenderest point, and is likely to stir up many heartburnings, should be trifled with; and I hope and trust Her Majesty's Government will not only 'seriously consider' this question, as the noble Duke tells us they are doing, but that they will seriously consider it with a view to its solution. . . . I agree that there are practical difficulties which have to be grappled with, and I do not think the Resolution we have listened to tells us how they are to be met. . . . The question has gone beyond the range of logic, and has got into the region of feeling on both sides, and if we are to pay great attention to the feelings of those who suffer from this grievance—and who are by no means so many as might at first be supposed—I think we must consider, too, upon the other side, the feelings of the clergy, which are greatly agitated on this question. The fact is, they are unwilling to assent to any great change, unless they see what it is to be, lest, before they are aware of what is being done, some principle shall have been admitted which is fatal to the principles of an Established Church, . . . and therefore they have a right to call upon your Lordships, not merely to pass abstract general resolutions, but to tell them what it is your desire to do; and when they have the whole case before them, I feel confident the clergy will not be behind others in endeavour-

¹ *Hansard*, May 15, 1876, pp. 616-626.

ing to give what is just and fair to their dissenting brethren, and also in attempting to settle a very difficult question, the keeping open of which appears to me, by its irritating influence, to be most dangerous to the Established Church. Your Lordships have a right to know the opinion of the right reverend Bench, individually and collectively, as to what, under difficult circumstances, they think ought to be done in this matter. I reserve to myself the full right of maintaining and acting upon my own opinions, which in this matter, as I have elsewhere stated, go somewhat beyond perhaps the majority of my right reverend brethren, and certainly beyond the majority of the clergy. . . . We [Bishops] do not propose to bring in a Bill; we desire that that should be done by the responsible advisers of the Crown; we are anxious that no time should be lost in the bringing forward of such a measure, and all we can do is to contribute our quota to the solution of the question when it comes before us. . . . It is said, my Lords, that you will not settle this question in a way satisfactory to the Liberation Society. No; I do not suppose you will. I am not at all certain but that one of the most unfortunate things that could happen to that body would be the settlement of this question in a moderate and candid manner. I am not sure that it is not more satisfactory to the members who are the great advocates of the Dissenting Claims in 'another place' to be able to make speeches upon the existing grievance. But what I want to do is to put an end to anything like a real grievance, though it affects only a few persons. I am anxious that we should see as soon as possible who it is who wishes to disestablish the Church of England, and who it is who wishes to maintain it. I am anxious to detach from the movement for disestablishment the agitation which is kept up on this question, and we can so detach it by taking the question fairly in hand. I do not believe that the great Nonconformist bodies in this country are very much in earnest about making more of a grievance of this subject than it really amounts to. I am sorry that some of them have taken a new view of the great and solemn responsibility of the State for the social, moral, and religious welfare of the community, and I hope they will learn to return more to the teachings of the fathers of the Nonconformist body on this subject. I am certain that those among them who, in former times, have secured the rights which their descendants now enjoy, have not done so by declamatory speeches, carefully prepared for the

platform, in order that they might excite agitation against the Established Church. They succeeded rather because, like Lardner and Watts, they were men of great learning, or, like others, whom we may remember in our day, they roused the mind and conscience by their eloquence. Such men secured the rights of their fellows, not by raising paltry questions as to how many words should be used in a graveyard, or in contending with the clergy of the Church of England. They held their own by their learning, by their eloquence, by their knowledge of the Scriptures, by the influence which they gained over men's hearts. In like manner, I do trust that the better feeling of the Nonconformists will be roused, and that the higher and nobler elements in these bodies will detach themselves from these petty squabbles, and not endeavour by means of them to injure a Church which, if they only knew their own interests well, they would see to be the great bulwark between them and other dangerous systems—the great help towards making this a truly religious country—religious in the highest sense, because uniting religion with moderation and reason.”

In the division which followed the Archbishop took no part, but Lord Granville's resolution was defeated by a large majority, sixteen Bishops voting against it.

The Conservative Government was now practically pledged to introduce a Bill, and the promise was fulfilled in the following spring (1877), when the Duke of Richmond brought in a 'Burials Acts Consolidation Bill' of enormous length. It contained only one clause dealing directly with the religious difficulty which lay at the bottom of the strife; the rest of the Bill, which extended to eighty-eight clauses and seven pages of schedules, consisting of provisions for simplifying what the Lord Chief-Justice had recently termed "the complicated, entangled, and confused mass of legislation going by the name of the 'Burials Acts.'"

The Duke's Bill was based, as he distinctly stated, "on sanitary and consolidation grounds," giving special facilities for the provision of new burial-places wherever they

might be needed ; but in a single clause, the 74th in the Bill, it was enacted that a *silent* funeral might be permitted in consecrated ground if desired by the relatives and friends of the deceased.

The Archbishop, in thanking the Government for the Bill, expressed his readiness to support it, such as it was, although it left much of the difficulty untouched.

“Some such scheme, starting from a sanitary point of view—about which I will not quarrel—will minimise the difficulties that must surround this question, and I am one of those who think, upon the whole, that it is not a bad thing to accept half of a good measure if you cannot get the whole.”¹

The Bill was printed and studied, and its sanitary provisions, the experts said, were very good. The Liberals were in a difficulty. Suppose it were to pass, some part at least of the standing grievance would disappear, and the Conservatives might even get the credit of having settled the dispute. But to oppose it outright, because it only gave half what had been asked for, would, at the least, be open to unkindly comment. So, when the second reading came on, Lord Granville met it, not by a direct negative, but by a resolution that “No amendment of the Burial laws will be satisfactory which does not enable the relatives . . . to conduct the funeral in any churchyard . . . with such Christian and orderly religious observances as to them may seem fit.” After a brilliant answer from Lord Salisbury, the Archbishop spoke. While he was evidently in favour of Lord Granville’s principle, he earnestly urged the House to accept the Bill as it stood, and to reject a resolution which could only have the effect of keeping the unseemly strife alive. The second reading was carried by a majority of 39, which included thirteen Bishops. Then came a startling change

¹ *Hansard*, March 13, 1877, p. 1849.

of front. The Government quietly announced its intention to drop the single clause which dealt with the religious difficulty, and then to pass the Bill as a merely sanitary measure.

The Archbishop was indignant. It was mainly on the strength of this particular clause that he had promised to support the Bill, and he had kept his word. If the clause were gone, he must reconsider his position.

"It would not," he said, "be respectful to your Lordships, any more than to the clergy and others interested in this question, that the words which I utter on this matter should have any uncertain sound. My Lords, the time has undoubtedly come when this matter should be settled . . . and defective as the clause in question was, it promised to give us some sort of solution of the difficulty. . . . It is not desirable that the Bill should go forward as a simple measure of sanitary reform. Every speaker who addressed your Lordships on the second reading—even those who were in favour of the Bill—said that the concession in question must sooner or later be made. If, then, it must be made, surely it would be better to make it with a good grace. It is not desirable that the whole country should be divided upon a question which ought not to enter into a political contest at all."¹

The Government, supported by the eloquence of the Bishop of Peterborough, declined to give way, and after an additional clause had been proposed by the Archbishop, and carried, for relieving the oft-told grievance of the clergy, an amendment was moved by Lord Harrowby, staunch Tory as he was, in favour of allowing not merely the "silent funeral" which the Government had at first proposed, but even the dreaded Nonconformist services beside the open grave. This amendment came twice before the House. The numbers in the first division were

¹ *Hansard*, May 17, 1877, p. 1045.

equal.¹ On the second the Government were in a minority of 16,² and the Bill was consequently withdrawn. The Archbishop voted on each occasion with Lord Harrowby, and his opponents were probably right in ascribing to his action the collapse of the Government Bill. He had declined emphatically to be a party to the "political trick," as he, perhaps erroneously, considered it, whereby support had been purchased in the country for a measure which had so quickly changed its shape when once its passing seemed secure. Nor was he alone in his opinion. The significance of the vote was unmistakable. The House of Commons had already four times assented to the provision for permitting other services besides those of the Church of England, and now that the House of Lords, too, in the face of a determined opposition on the part of a Conservative Government, had declared it desirable to grant the concession for which Nonconformists had so long appealed, the result had become certain. The only question that remained was when and how it should be granted.

The Archbishop's Diary has the following references to the subject:—

"*LAMBETH, May 13th, 1877.*—Yesterday I had a most important interview with Lord Beaconsfield on the Burials Bill. He looked very ill; right arm in a sling from gout. Quite in accord with me, and as acute as possible respecting the best way of proceeding. 'The question ought to be settled.' Agreed to bring it before the Cabinet. — alone would give trouble. . . ."

"*May 20th, 1877.*—A busy and agitating week. On Thursday night the Burials debate. It served the Ministry right that, with all their whipping, they only got a tie against Lord Harrowby's motion, and if the Archbishop of York had voted as he spoke, they would have been beaten. It was somewhat absurd to be dividing the House against them, knowing that their chief was all

¹ 102 on either side.

² 127 against 111.

the time on my side. He sent to me on Monday to say virtually that he could not manage the Cabinet, but he hoped I would persevere in the course I had sketched out. It was amusing to see him sitting quietly throughout the debate, without saying a word, and voting with his colleagues, while hoping they would be beaten. The week, as may be supposed, was a very busy one, trying to make arrangements for this debate in the midst of all other work. At Lord Derby's reception at the Foreign Office I got hold of —. Found he perfectly agreed with me and Lord Beaconsfield that the matter ought to be settled, and when pressed to settle it, he could only say that, unfortunately, parties, like fish, were always guided by the tail. Made arrangements with Eversley and the Duke of Somerset to keep the Liberals up to the mark. I am convinced that if the matter is not settled by the Church, the violent political Dissenters will rejoice. But I think we have managed to take this dangerous weapon out of their hands."

Before the Bill disappeared from the House, the Archbishop took occasion once again to urge, both upon its friends and its foes, the need of keeping the subject, if possible, from becoming, as it was likely to become, the mere shuttlecock of rival parties.

"I rise," he said, "to express my most earnest hope that during the six or nine months which must elapse before this measure can appear again before your Lordships, it will be calmly considered by all those who have to do with this question out of doors. We know that there are professional agitators who live and thrive upon questions of this kind, and it is difficult to prevent an agitation arising on such questions, in which the real merits of so difficult and delicate a subject are lost sight of. . . . Your Lordships' House has by a considerable majority recorded its opinion that this question ought to be settled, and settled in a particular direction. . . . I am most anxious that the clergy of the Church of England, during the interval which the decision of the Ministry has procured for them, should consider the matter in that spirit of kindly Christian charity which is the best ornament of their profession."¹

¹ *Hansard*, June 25, 1877, p. 183.

The Archbishop had thus anticipated, it is clear, the re-introduction of a Government measure in the following session, but the Ministry declined to touch the thorny question any further, and for three years it came no more before the House of Lords. In 1879, indeed, in the last session of a dying Parliament, Mr. Marten, the Conservative member for the town of Cambridge, by a skilful or fortunate adventure, carried through the House of Commons unobserved a little Bill of three short clauses, under the unattractive title of "The Public Health (1875) Amendment (Interments) Bill." Not till it was leaving the House of Commons did Mr. Osborne Morgan and his friends observe that, by its technical reference to existing Acts of Parliament, it made acquisition of additional burying-places so easy as to open a new path for bringing the embittered feud to an end. Opposition was then too late, and the Bill, though vehemently opposed by the Liberal party in the House of Lords, became law¹ without further question. What might have been its results had time permitted it is difficult to say. The opportunity was not given, and before another year had passed the difficulties were faced and solved in a simpler and a bolder fashion.

The general election of 1880 brought Mr. Gladstone back to power, with an immense majority, and it was certain that the Burials question would now be grappled with in earnest. Men began to ask how the Liberals would use their triumph. Would the extreme men or the moderates prevail? Would Church as well as Churchyard be demanded? Would every parish have its burial-board, and the parson be deprived of his control? These were no imaginary dangers, and the more timid spirits were in consternation. With Mr. Bright and Mr. Chamberlain in

¹ 42 and 43 Vict. cap. 31.

the Cabinet, and Mr. Osborne Morgan Judge Advocate-General, every safeguard, they said, was gone. The Archbishop formed a different estimate of the position :—

“I am not afraid,” he said, in a letter to a friend, “of anything very violent either in Burials Bills or in larger things. The Government has common-sense enough to see that the inevitable Bill will be all the better for the ballast of a Bishop or two; and then they can always lay it on the Bishops if anything goes wrong. Selborne is as true as steel, and won’t lend himself to any bullying.”

And he was right. Before the new Ministry had been many days in office he received the following letter :—

The Lord Chancellor to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“ May 7, 1880.

“MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—It is probable that Her Majesty’s Government will be desirous of taking in hand, without any delay, the settlement of the long-pending Burials question, and this may be proposed to be done, if not in the exact form, substantially upon the lines, of the measure for that purpose which has commanded, in several sessions, the general assent of the Liberal party in the House of Commons. If there are any particular safeguards against indecency and disorder, which your Grace may consider not to have been sufficiently provided for by that measure (which, in general terms, made *all* disorderly or indecent proceedings at funerals a misdemeanour), I am sure that any suggestion proceeding from you, and consistent (as I do not doubt it would be) with the principle of the measure, would receive careful consideration.

“In determining whether the Bill should first be introduced in the Lords or in the Commons, it would be a material assistance to the Government to know (as far as your Grace may be able and willing to give them any information on that subject) to what extent they might hope that the settlement of the question, upon the lines which I have indicated, would be facilitated by support or acquiescence from the Episcopal Bench. I am not sure, whether any of those Bishops who, upon former occasions,

have regarded the principle of such a settlement favourably (or at least as one which it was not for the true interest of the Church to oppose), have seen reason in consequence of Mr. Marten's Act, or for any other cause, to alter that opinion. The Government, being persuaded that the time has come when such a settlement can be no longer delayed, would anxiously desire that it should take place with as much concurrence as possible, from those who best understand, and are most desirous to promote, the true interests of the Church : and, if this concurrence may be hoped for in the House of Lords, it may be a reason for introducing the measure in that, rather than in the other House.—Believe me, my dear Lord Archbishop, ever yours faithfully,

“SELBORNE.”

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Lord Chancellor.

“LAMBETH PALACE, 10th May 1880.

“MY DEAR LORD CHANCELLOR,—I have no hesitation in saying that the principles embodied in Lord Harrowby's amendments which I supported in the House of Lords still approve themselves to my judgment as offering a fair solution of the difficulties respecting burial. Two points, however, occur to me—

“Lord Harrowby's amendment was accompanied by other amendments, proposed by the Archbishop of York and myself, securing some relief for the Clergy in certain cases which have been felt to press hard upon them.

“Convocation has since considered the suggestions made in these amendments of the two Archbishops, and the Convocation of Canterbury at least (I am not sure about York) has embodied a judgment on the subject in its answers to the letters of business, and its report to the Crown. You will no doubt carefully consider the claim of the Clergy to such relief. . . . Unfortunately I cannot at present speak for my brethren of the Episcopal Bench. They are all dispersed in their dioceses till after Trinity Sunday ordinations. On Tuesday following that day I have summoned them to meet, and I will then, unless I hear from you to the contrary, lay before them confidentially your letter of the 7th, and any other communication I may receive from you.—Believe me to be, my dear Lord Chancellor, yours sincerely,

A. C. CANTUAR.”

The Lord Chancellor to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"May 18, 1880.

"MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—The Burials Bill will be introduced into the House of Lords. Your Grace's reply to my letter has received the consideration which was justly due to it; and I hope that the Bill may be in a form which will meet your approval. It will deal in the same manner with burials in churchyards, and in consecrated ground in cemeteries: and, on the other hand, will relieve the clergy from penalties for burying, with the service of the Church (when it might otherwise lawfully be used), in unconsecrated ground; such, *e.g.* as the cemetery at Northampton. It will, in the enactments as to the alternative of silent burial, or burial with religious service, and as to the safeguards against disorder, etc., be in conformity with the amendments to the Bill of 1877 which were carried on Lord Harrowby's motion, in the House of Lords. And (in accordance with what I collect to be the judgment, both of your Grace and of the Archbishop of York) I propose to introduce into it a clause exempting the clergy from penalties (civil or ecclesiastical) for any act or omission in accordance with the recommendations submitted to the Crown (in the form of altered and new rubrics for the Burial Office) by the Convocation of Canterbury; and which have also (with one exception) been agreed to by the Convocation of York.

"Your Grace will be at liberty to communicate what has passed between you and myself on this subject (in confidence, until the Bill is brought in, as I hope it will be on Tuesday or Thursday in next week) to the Bishops at their meeting on Monday.—Believe me, my dear Lord Archbishop, ever yours faithfully,
SELBORNE."

Accordingly the Bill was introduced by the Lord Chancellor on May 27th. The Radicals found its concessions to the clergy most distasteful, and against some of them the Liberationists at once protested in strong terms. They objected specially to the enactment that the graveside service in consecrated ground must be "Christian" as well as

orderly,¹ a provision, as will be seen, for which the Archbishop really cared. It was in keeping with his reiterated appeal to a Christianity wider than membership in the Church of England, and its importance reached, in his opinion, far beyond the immediate occasion. And in accordance with his wish, the Government had embodied in the Bill his own suggestions of three years before for allowing the clergy, at the request, or with the consent of the friends of the deceased, to use an alternative service, approved by the Bishop, in place of that provided in the Book of Common Prayer.

On the motion for the second reading of the Bill, Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln moved its rejection in an elaborate and earnest speech, in which he gave expression to what was not unfairly described as the almost unanimous opinion of the clergy against the principle of such a Bill. Already nearly 16,000 clergy had signed a petition for its rejection; and he fully shared their wishes and their fears. He described the Bill as "an Act for the martyrdom of the National Church under the narcotic influences of chloroform. . . ."

"It is a Burials Bill, and I venture to predict that if it becomes law, it will be an Act for the burial of the Church of England herself, not indeed as a church, but as a national establishment of religion."

His own experience, he said, showed him there was no need for such a measure.

"Twelve years ago I was nominated to the See of Lincoln. It is the most extensive diocese in England, and it is mainly agricultural. I can assure your Lordships that I have never known a single instance of the grievance complained of. The religious dissenters—and I am thankful that most of them are such—thankfully accept the Burial Service of the Church of

¹ The words are, "The burial may take place, either without any religious service, or with such Christian and orderly religious service at the grave as such person shall think fit."

England—performed by ministers of the Church in our churchyards, and would be sorry to be deprived of it.”

While the Bishop was actually speaking, a resolution was brought to him from the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, then sitting, which desired “by its solemn protest, to deliver itself of all responsibility as to any dishonour which may be done to Almighty God by the character of the worship which in the event of the passing of this Bill may hereafter be offered in our churchyards.” Alike on religious and on social grounds the Bishop of Lincoln dreaded the disloyalty and the confusion which such a Bill must cause. “I may not live to see them,” he concluded, “but others I fear will. I have liberated my own conscience, and I earnestly pray you to reject the Bill.”

The speech had been listened to with close attention, and the Archbishop, contrary to anticipation, rose immediately to reply.

“I should not now have interposed,” he said, “were it not that I fear the voice of my right rev. brother—a man so deeply respected, not only in England, but throughout the Christian Church—might be supposed adequately to represent the whole feelings of the Bench on which he and I sit. No one can have a greater respect for the right rev. Prelate than I have; his simple earnestness and his determination to adhere to his principles are worthy of all praise; but I may be allowed to doubt whether on some occasions it has not been found that another mode of pressing the principles of the Church of England may have been more beneficial to the Church than that which he has adopted. We have heard from my right rev. brother that he considers that the Church of England, if this Bill passes, will be exposed to martyrdom. He did not say what was to be the exact form in which we were to suffer martyrdom, but I think that in those ages of the Church with which he is so familiar, and with which his name is so greatly associated, martyrdom was understood in some other sense than that which he has brought before your Lordships’ notice to-day. . . . I was sorry to hear my right rev. brother say that this Bill proposed what would be

a dishonour to Almighty God. No doubt the words were not his own, but he quoted a resolution which appears to have been passed in the Lower House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury since I left the Chair¹ about half or three-quarters of an hour before your Lordships met here this evening. . . . What is that which is to be dishonouring to Almighty God? Is it to be supposed to be a dishonour to Almighty God that, over the grave of one who is at present buried in silence, some one may offer a Christian prayer, or read a portion of the Word of God? Does that constitute a dishonour to Almighty God any more than burying the dead in consecrated ground without any words of Christian hope or consolation? I cannot believe that my right rev. brother really thinks that this uttering of a few words of Christian prayer by any relative or friend, or by any individual appointed by the relatives, or the reading of portions of Scripture, will be dishonouring to God. I believe his mind was so occupied with what he supposes to be the inevitable consequences of the passing of the Bill that he forgot to consider what the measure itself is. . . . Is it a desecration of the churchyard that the Word of God should be read in it, and that Christian prayer should be offered in it, unless that Christian prayer, and that reading of the Word of God, proceed from the mouth of an ordained clergyman? I cannot believe that this is the opinion of your Lordships, and I cannot believe that such is the general opinion of the clergy and laity of the Church of England. . . . I should wish to state what is the principle of the Bill, so far as I understand it. It is to allow the burial, with religious rites, of persons who at present suffer under the grievance of being prevented from being buried with those religious rites. The diocese of Lincoln is a happy diocese in many respects, besides that of being presided over by its present Bishop. It is a diocese, it appears, in which there is no such thing as dissent, excepting in the most religious form. Yet I have heard rumours of some sort of dissensions² between some of

¹ The Archbishop is theoretically and technically Chairman of the whole Convocation, although the Bishops and clergy sit in two separate Houses.

² The reference is to the Bishop of Lincoln's recent refusal to allow the title of "Reverend" to be applied to a Wesleyan minister in an inscription on a tombstone. The case, which had excited much interest, had been successively before the Diocesan and Provincial Courts, and was finally decided, against the Bishop, in the final Court of Appeal on January 21, 1876.

the religious bodies and my right rev. brother. Though I grant that they all revere and respect his deeply religious character, I am not sure that they are not drawn to him a good deal by this—that his form of the Church of England is more or less of the same type as their own form of religion, somewhat narrow—and that he has never perfectly mastered what I conceive to be the glory of the Church of England: that it is a National Church, wide as the nation, ready to embrace all in the nation who are anxious to join it, and not making narrow sectarian distinctions between those who adhere very rigidly to one or another set of opinions. There are other dioceses in which, unless I am greatly mistaken, the Baptist denomination very largely exists; and I believe it is a fact that in numerous cases in those dioceses persons are desirous to be buried by the clergyman of the parish, which is prevented by the present state of the law; and an integral part of this Bill will afford them the opportunity which they desire. One would suppose that there was no object in this Bill but to satisfy the Liberation Society. I am not here to say what were the motives for introducing the Bill, but I may state some of the reasons why I supported a similar proposal three years ago. One reason which weighed greatly with me was that I thought a large number of dissenters were anxious to have some religious service read over their dead, and this Bill relieves them from that difficulty. . . . I am quite aware, as the right rev. Prelate pointed out, that there are many persons clamouring for this measure who will not be satisfied by it. But I think it is a dangerous principle not to give men what is right, because there are some unreasonable persons who demand more. It is my belief that in conceding what is felt to be right by men who are steadfast members of the Church of England, you strengthen the position of the Church. I believe fully that there are many persons now clamouring for this measure who desire no less than the destruction of the Church of England. But I am not prepared, because they so clamour, to refuse to carry a measure which I believe will really strengthen the position you occupy when these attacks are made. What we wish is to recall the dissenting bodies to that better mind which they showed in former times. Many of them may be embittered against us by narrow sectarian animosities; we desire to show them a more excellent way. We act with their members in works of charity. We act with them in the dissemination of the

Scriptures. We are acting with them at this moment in preparing a new translation of the Scriptures, and that under the auspices of both Houses of Convocation. We act with them in this way: that while they avail themselves of our learning, we avail ourselves of theirs. . . . We use their hymns, and they use our prayers. These are modes in which men may be made to feel that with all their differences they are Christian brethren; and if they are Christian brethren, is it for a moment to be endured that we shall regard the offering up of prayer and the reading of Scripture in their presence as a desecration? My Lords, we live in dangerous times. Systems are abroad both here and on the Continent which threaten both social and family life. Christians who revere one common Lord, and who are united in one common love to Him, cannot afford to be aggravating their differences, and that in the most unpleasant of all ways, by keeping them alive in the hour of death, and in the graveyard. If this Bill does nothing else, it will convince our Nonconformist brethren—however violent may be the attempts to displace us from that which is our rightful inheritance—believing as we do that great blessings are secured to this nation by the system of faith and worship we maintain—that we do regard them as brethren, and desire to unite with them in the name of the religion we in common profess, and join hand in hand with them in resisting those who are opposed to our social system and family life. For these reasons, my Lords, I feel it my duty to support the second reading of this Bill.”¹

After a long and vigorous debate, the second reading was carried by 126 votes against 101. Ten Bishops² voted with the majority, and six with the minority.

On the announcement of the result, and especially of the Episcopal votes which had contributed to it, the excitement of the clergy rose to fever heat. Not even in 1874, when the Public Worship Bill controversy was at its height, had such a stream of alarmed and indignant protests poured from the country parsonages into Lambeth.

¹ *Hansard*, June 3, 1880, pp. 1013-1025.

² Including two Bishops (Carlisle and Llandaff) who had voted against Lord Harrowby's amendment three years before.

All who were with the Archbishop in those busy weeks must recall the genuine distress with which he received these daily budgets—a distress due not merely to the fact of his finding himself in opposition to so overwhelming a majority of the clergy, but also to the evidence which the letters afforded of the views of so many of his friends with respect to English Nonconformity. For the most part, he could do no more than acknowledge the documents as they arrived, though now and then he wrote more fully, and sometimes even sternly rebuked the spirit of the more vehement remonstrants. To those who expressed, with the Bishop of Lincoln, their fear of immediate disestablishment, and its attendant consequences, he could only send such a reply as the following :—

“You will readily believe what pain it costs me to learn the distress and alarm of those whom you represent. I can only assure you that in my deliberate opinion the perils you anticipate will be removed rather than precipitated by our conceding, with such Christian safeguards as this Bill provides, the removal of what is felt by many to be a grievance, and is daily represented as such in a hundred exaggerated forms. Nor can I at all share your fear that ‘a general reign of sacrilege and confusion’ is likely to ensue. I am called upon to act, in my public capacity, upon the best judgment I can, with God’s help, form, as to what is likely to be for the good of our Church and Realm. I have tried to do so conscientiously and straightforwardly, and I believe that a few years hence people will see that we were right.”

Other letters were in a different tone. A few sentences from some of them will be enough.

One clergyman wrote :—

“The measure looks simple, but is an artful, treacherous, and insidious blow at Episcopacy, abolishing the consecration of the Bishops, the Holy Orders of the clergy, and the authority of the Book of Common Prayer. I am astonished to think that

your Grace can expect an honest measure from infidels and heretics, and I implore you, as your Grace would tender the love of the great Head of the Church, to pluck up courage and strangle this young viper of heresy and schism."

Another wrote :—

"Shame, shame on all those Bishops who support this most iniquitous measure ! Most fearful will be their responsibility, and awful their retribution, who are thus doing their utmost to assist the enemies of the Church to destroy her."

And yet another, who published his letters, with extracts from what he described as the "continuous stream" of thanks he had received for thus "giving expression to what was in the hearts of all" :—

"Allow me to assure your Grace that whatever may become of the outward manifestation of this agitation which has so startled you, the deep feeling of indignation which has occasioned it will *never* calm down. Every separate invasion of our churchyards by the ministers of divisions and of offences . . . will revive the feeling of indignation with which this Bill and its promoters are now regarded. . . . I am bold to tell you that hundreds are saying now . . . that your sympathies are Presbyterian, and not Catholic ; that as a supposed member of the Liberal party you are suspected of something more than complicity with the avowed designs of the 'backbone' thereof against the rights, the liberties, and the possessions of the English Church. . . . I feel bound to tell you that you are mistaken indeed if you imagine that the lapse of twelve months, or of twelve years, or of twelve times twelve, will suffice to appease the resentment, to allay the bitterness, or to still the agitation which you have so largely helped to arouse and to kindle."

The following is a specimen of the answers which he now and then thought it right to send to letters such as these :—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. — — —.

" LAMBETH PALACE, *June 1880.*

" MY DEAR SIR,—I cannot but think that that Christian humility, which I have no doubt you desire to cultivate, ought naturally to have suggested to you that the two Archbishops, and the other Bishops from whom you differ in opinion, are as conscientious as yourself, and that as they have had larger opportunities of observation than you can enjoy, and act under a deep sense of the responsibilities of their office, they ought not to be spoken of by you in such language as your letter contains. It is inherent in the office of Bishops that it is their duty to guide rather than to follow those over whom they are placed.

" I cannot doubt that on reflection you will regret writing as you have done, and I earnestly trust that the excitement which is expressed by your language will soon give way to a more Christian frame of mind.—Yours faithfully,

" A. C. CANTUAR."

The second reading had been carried, but the Bill had still to encounter perils from more sides than one. Some of those who had supported it were bent upon amendments in Committee, and Lord Mount Edgcumbe, with the support of the Archbishop of York, and of many other Bishops, secured the insertion of an important clause rendering the main part of the Bill inoperative in all parishes in which, either in churchyard or cemetery, there was any unconsecrated ground. Archbishop Tait opposed this change, being sure that the Bill, thus docked, could never pass the House of Commons, and that, even if it did pass in such a shape, the long-standing strife would be still kept open.

Several other amendments of importance were proposed without the same success. The Archbishop voted throughout with the Government, and in the end the Bill was reported to the House with certain verbal alterations and additions, but not materially changed (except by Lord

Mount Edgcumbe's amendment) from the form in which it had been introduced a few weeks before. On the third reading a debate of unusual importance at such a stage took place. In the course of it, the Bishop of Peterborough, who had not been present at any earlier stage, referred, in an eloquent speech against the measure, to the clause for which the Archbishop cared so much—the provision that the services in consecrated ground must in every case be Christian.

“The provision,” he said, “was open to the peril arising from the fact that it was a distinct violation of the principle of religious equality. . . . He valued the clause himself, because it was a recognition by the Legislature of the principle that the services in churchyards ought to be Christian, but if those parties [who were opposed to it in the House of Commons] succeeded in striking it out of the Bill, he thought that in practice it would very little matter. . . . A person who professed himself a Christian for a single day, and abandoned the title next day, might succeed in having an unchristian service performed at the grave. Whatever its intention, the clause was practically inoperative, and he believed it would vanish from the Bill.”

For such an attack, coming from such a quarter, the Archbishop had been unprepared, and he spoke in reply with a warmth unusual to him in the House of Lords :—

“The speech of his right rev. brother was calculated to do infinite mischief to the Bill, and infinite mischief to himself. He thought that on cool and calm reflection the right rev. Prelate would come to the conclusion that it would have been better for the Church, for their Lordships' House, and for himself, that he had not made these remarks on the word ‘Christian,’ for certainly they were calculated to encourage an effort in the other House of Parliament to have it expunged. It was very undesirable that a Bishop of the Church of England should, before that House, even appear to argue against the introduction of the word ‘Christian’ into such a Bill as this, and to

vilify those who claimed liberty of conscience, and the right to perform their ministrations in the churchyards, by saying that to-day they would declare themselves Christians, and to-morrow assume the character of heathens. He spoke with some warmth, because he thought the occasion required it. While he (the Archbishop) took upon himself the whole blame which his right rev. brother seemed to impute to him, of being willing to run the risk even of losing the Bill rather than lose its religious character, he believed that in expressing himself as he had done upon this particular point he was expressing the general feeling both of the clergy and of the laity of the country."

The Bishop of Peterborough rose with the utmost eagerness to disclaim what he termed the "monstrous" interpretation which had been put upon his speech, and the incident is worth recording only as an evidence of the vital importance attached by the Archbishop to the principle which underlay the words in question. Some private letters afterwards passed between himself and the Bishop of Peterborough on the subject, each Prelate virtually admitting that in the excitement of debate he had spoken with perhaps unnecessary warmth. The Archbishop's final letter was as follows:—

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of
Peterborough.*

"LAMBETH, June 29, 1880.

"MY DEAR BISHOP,—Most heartily do I thank you for your kind and Christian letter. In this busy world, with so many conflicts of opinion and duty, I feel I have much to regret in the manner in which I do what I feel to be right, but it is cheering to know that in you I have to deal with a friend who makes allowance for failures.—Ever most truly yours,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

The Government, as represented by Mr. Osborne Morgan, had no easy task in piloting their Bill through

the rocks and shoals which awaited it in the House of Commons. The clause, enacting the "Christian" character of the Services, met, as had been anticipated, with a prolonged and strenuous opposition, which was more than once renewed. But the pledge which had been given to the Archbishop was faithfully observed. The Government announced that they would withdraw the measure if the word "Christian" were struck out, and the Bill came back on September 3 to the House of Lords, without, indeed, Lord Mount Edgcumbe's restrictive clause limiting it to parishes in which there was no unconsecrated ground, but with the provision for "Christian and orderly" services unimpaired. The Archbishop was, throughout, in constant and harmonious consultation with the Government as to the verbal changes which might, and might not, be accepted. On August 30, Mr. Osborne Morgan wrote as follows:—

"I am exceedingly anxious about the reception by the House of Lords of the amendment striking out Lord Mount Edgcumbe's clause. It is utterly impossible for us to accept it in any form, and if the Bill comes back to us without it, we must throw it out at once. . . ."

A division was, however, taken in the Upper House on the question whether the Lords should adhere to the clause in question. By a majority of 35 they decided to accept the Commons' amendment, and the Bill thus passed into law almost precisely in its original form.

The debates were closed, as they had been opened, by an impressive speech from the venerable Bishop of Lincoln.

While "fully persuaded that the Bill had been intended as a message of peace," he felt bound to express his concurrence in the fears of the clergy generally, that it would prove, instead, to be "the cause of endless animosities, and the signal for the outbreak of a religious war"; and that

it would lead to "such sacrilegious desecration of holy things and of holy places as may be expected to be visited by Divine judgments." Nevertheless, now that it had virtually become law, he earnestly called upon the clergy, "as ministers of peace, and supporters of order and law," either to comply as loyal citizens with the legislative enactment, or patiently to resign their cures, remembering that if the Church be true to her Divine commission "she is sure of Divine support, and may even be strengthened by suffering, and grow by persecution."¹

The Bishop's weighty words were not spoken without cause. The excitement among the clergy had grown more and more intense, and the fears of disorganisation and disaster were by no means confined to the enthusiasts or alarmists who had raised a similar cry in former controversies. Nothing could more clearly show the widespread character of the "consternation," than the action deliberately taken by the Lower House of Convocation in its closing group of sessions. For many years attempts had been periodically made to secure a distinct allusion to Convocation in the wording of any Acts of Parliament relating to the Church. This constitutional endeavour had usually been in vain. When the Burials Bill was to be drafted, the Archbishop seized the opportunity to secure a full reference to the advice of Convocation about an alternative service for use in special cases,² and, to the outspoken indignation of the Liberation Society,³ the actual wording of the 'Convocation Service' was set forth with full acknowledgment in a schedule to the Bill. Nothing could have conceded more precisely what had been so often asked for, and the value of the precedent was made obvious by the Liberation Society's vehement

¹ *Hansard*, September 3, 1880, p. 1170.

² See his letter to the Lord Chancellor quoted above, p. 392.

³ They formally protested against the Convocation Clause.

opposition. Yet so distasteful to most members of Convocation was the notion of being in any way associated, even with a single clause of such a measure, that, though they held to their recommendation, they desired the omission of any reference to Convocation as the source from whence it came.¹ The original wording of the clause would undoubtedly have been carried by the Government in spite of Radical opposition,² but when abandoned by those in whose interest it had been inserted, it was of course immediately struck out.

A still more remarkable evidence of the general alarm was afforded by the deliberate proposal in Convocation that the Church should for ever abandon her own cherished grave-side service, provided a similar rule of silence should apply to Nonconformists.

"We are asking Church people," it was said, "to make an enormous sacrifice, but we have thought it would be better to master our prejudices and overcome our repugnance than to allow anything which would dishonour Almighty God. . . . Though it would deprive Church people of privileges they highly prize, the result would be well worth the sacrifice."³

The proposal, however, although advocated by men of such weight and influence as Canons Wilkinson,⁴ Gregory,⁵ and Sumner,⁶ was after full debate rejected by the House. It is clear from such instances as these how serious was the dismay of sober Churchmen as to the inevitable consequences, as they supposed, of the detested measure.

¹ See the speeches of Archdeacon Harrison and others in Convocation, and of Mr. Beresford Hope in the House of Commons. *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1880, pp. 117, 120, 210, etc.; *Hansard*, Aug. 28, 1880, p. 574.

² The Lord Chancellor and Mr. Gladstone wrote fully to the Archbishop to that effect.

³ *Chronicle of Convocation*, July 15, 1880, p. 209.

⁴ Now Bishop of Truro.

⁵ Now Dean of St. Paul's.

⁶ Now Bishop of Guildford, and Prolocutor.

If such were the feelings of so many of the leading clergy, it is not to be wondered at that others, in positions less responsible, gave expression to their sentiments in a more unguarded way. Many country clergymen wrote or telegraphed to the Archbishop that they intended to resist by force any attempt by Nonconformists to take advantage of the Act (one rector announcing that he had provided pitchforks for the purpose), and the letters of these stormy weeks possess a permanent and peculiar interest. A very few quotations will be enough.

One clergyman wrote :—

“ After a long and anxious tenure of ministerial life, extending over a period of thirty-five eventful years, during which I have humbly endeavoured to uphold the cause of Christ against the devil, the world, and the flesh, I find myself on the eve of contemplating the surrender of my parish, Holy Orders, and Christian profession (!), because my spiritual superiors cannot find it in their heart to be consistent with their sworn duty to defend me against injury and insult, desecration and oppression, in the form of a Burials Bill which they have sanctioned by their votes, and by which order, truth, religion, and brotherly love are outraged, destroyed, and deleted.”

A second enclosed a printed sermon in his letter, with the following sentence marked :—

“ You are fully aware, brethren, and you cannot be surprised at the fact, that a number of the incumbent clergy have determined to resist this Bill . . . to the utmost of their power, and yield up their sacred inheritances only to force. I am one of those who has distinctly and publicly expressed this determination, and I feel bound to justify the course before my people.”

Another wrote :—

“ I beg to inform your Grace that I shall feel conscientiously bound to resist every attempt to put in force here the Burials Bill. . . . I am not in a position to make precisely the same promise on behalf of any other person, but I am in correspond-

ence with several hundred of the beneficed clergy in every part of England and Wales, who, to a great extent, think with me on the question, and may in all probability be expected to carry their principles into practice."

And another :—

"No power on earth will compel me to submit to such an unjust measure ; I had rather resign, and live on bread and water the rest of my life, than assist God's enemies to rob Him of what has been dedicated to His service, and this Bill is only a part of the design, and promoted with that object. Should this unjust Bill pass, there will not be a parish where there will not be unpleasant scenes where now all is peace. To what an awful state we have come when the Church's own Bishops assist her enemies to destroy her."

There were others who, in a quieter spirit, took a not less gloomy view. One speaker in Convocation expressed it as his deliberate opinion that the effect of what had been done would be "to check, if not to put a stop to, the building and restoring and adornment of churches."

"For my own part," he said, "I have resolved, not in the heat of the moment, but deliberately, and in cold blood, that I will do nothing more until some steps are taken to reassure the minds of the clergy. . . . I intend to withdraw my support from the Church Defence Society, and also from the Church Building Society. I do not intend to do anything whatever, until I have further security, for the extension of the Church in its material aspect."¹

The Archbishop had never been lacking in courage and self-reliance, but something more than an ordinary measure of strength was needed to face with equanimity and hopefulness this unvarying stream of despondent anticipation, which tried him more severely than the most virulent attacks. Again and again he talked over the position and its prospects with men whose views were other than his

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, July 16, 1880, p. 242.

own, reiterating his deliberate and unfaltering opinion that the fears of his friends were, to say the least, strangely exaggerated ; that there was not the smallest reason to anticipate that the churchyards of England would become either "wildernesses" or "scenes of brawl and riot"; or that the money of Churchmen would cease to be spent both on churches and churchyards. The Act, he believed, would be far less used in practice than most men on either side supposed ; while, on the other hand, it was obvious that the grievance, such as it was, would be removed from any who honestly felt it press upon them in their hours of sorrow ; and that it would at least be no longer available as a formidable platform weapon in the hands of the Church's foes.

He was in the midst of his quadrennial visitation of the diocese, and on September 7—the very day that the measure received the Royal Assent—he prefaced his Visitation Charge at Dover with some grave and earnest words about the prevailing agitation on the subject—making his appeal, as usual, with a certain quiet confidence, to religious Nonconformists as well as to orthodox Churchmen.

After describing with some care the double object of the Bill—the relief of conscientious Nonconformists, and the removal of embarrassing restrictions from the clergy,—he continued as follows :—

"Moreover, with the concurrence of a large majority in the House of Commons, we have maintained that no services shall be introduced into our churchyards which are not Christian. I cannot believe that there are any among us who do not realise the importance of this distinction. I cannot think that there is any man, professing the faith of the Church of England, who does not hold that there is an infinite difference between those who profess to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and those who repudiate Him. I should be astonished if there were any who

really held that, provided a man is a Nonconformist or a Roman Catholic, he might, on account of his separation from our own Church, almost as well be an Atheist or a Mohammedan. Therefore, I greatly prize the extension of the clause which provides that all services in our churchyards shall be Christian as well as orderly. I am glad also that the rights of the clergy are maintained in the general care and superintendence of their churchyards. Having once made up my mind to concede the liberty of interring Nonconformists, who desired to be buried near the graves of their more orthodox fathers, in places which I was glad to find they professed to regard as sacred on account of family or other tender associations, I could not give a conscientious support to the introduction of clauses into this Bill which would, in my judgment, have been fatal to its principle. And if, in this particular, I have differed from several of my brethren on the Bench, and from a large body of the clergy, I feel sure that none of you would have wished me to act against my conscientious convictions. It is a satisfaction to me to know that some of the most respected of the clergy in this diocese, and elsewhere, entirely agree with me in the general course I have taken upon this whole subject. On the other hand, I am aware that, not unnaturally, the change which this Act will introduce is very distasteful to many of you. I cannot but think that many of the clergy have exaggerated to themselves the greatness of the contemplated change, and I can understand their dissatisfaction. . . . My own hope is that it will serve to strengthen the Church by removing a most painful cause of controversy, and uniting with us more closely in death those whom unfortunate circumstances have alienated in their lifetime from the beneficent ministration of the Church of their fathers. . . . I would add a few words of advice to those for whose sake this Bill has been passed into a law. I am aware that violent agitators among them are altogether dissatisfied with it on account of its Christian character, and the measure of consideration which it has given to the clergy. To these men it is useless for me to appeal. I have never doubted that they had further objects behind. Many desire the utter subversion of our Established Church, and are ready, with this object, to unite with the foes of all religion. Such assaults, I need not say, we are determined to withstand. But may I not say to the great body of religious Nonconformists in this country that we look confidently to them, to their good

principle and good faith, and kindly Christian feeling, to falsify the dismal vaticinations which have been uttered in some quarters, and to show that over the grave at least they desire that the controversies which keep us asunder should be hushed, and that nothing should be heard in the ground in which we lay our dead, in sure and certain hope of a resurrection, but words of peaceful hope and comfort, which will approve themselves to Him who is the Resurrection and the Life?"¹

It was the Archbishop's last public utterance upon the long-familiar subject. His words were criticised at the time as "the outcome of a well-intentioned optimism, which the event, unfortunately, will too soon falsify."

But he had judged more truly than his critics. The vehement voices, of which a specimen has been given, found no echo in the calm good-sense of the English clergy as a body. They had resisted so long as it seemed possible to avert the blow. Now that it had fallen, the fact was accepted with a Christian courtesy, kindliness, and self-restraint, which have never perhaps received a sufficient meed of praise.

Ten years have passed, and it is already difficult to realise the spirit of fear, and even horror, with which at its birth the Bill was looked upon by sober men. Have the "dismal vaticinations" of which the Archbishop spoke proved true? Will any one contend that the Church is weaker to-day than she was before the dreaded Bill passed into law? And for the churchyards and their desecration, let the answer be stated in the straightforward words of one of those who at the time of its becoming law protested honestly against the measure as fraught with gravest wrong and peril.²

In his opening address at the Church Congress of 1887, the Bishop of Lichfield, after a reference to the

¹ *The Church of the Future*, pp. 59-64.

² See the *Lichfield Diocesan Magazine*, Oct. 1880.

wholesome issue of the Education Acts, spoke thus, amid assenting cheers—

“Not less remarkable has been the result of the Burials Act. What gloomy anticipations were rife among us as to the disorder and scandals which would be witnessed in our churchyards if this measure should ever pass! And what has been the result? The Act has been to a large extent a dead letter, even in the Principality to which it owes its origin. Our churchyards are as peaceful and orderly as they were twenty years ago. Here and there, at rare intervals, a burial service other than that of the Church of England may take place, but the Act, in the main, has made very little difference after all the alarm and foreboding which it excited before it passed into law.”¹

The admission was as honourable to the speaker as it was absolutely true in fact. The whole history of the stormy controversy is significant to the last degree. It has been told at length, less perhaps on account of its intrinsic importance than as an example of the sort of difficulties and dangers among which a leader in the Church is called to steer in democratic and ‘reforming’ days. It is the part of a wise man to estimate at its true importance the opposition which in each particular case confronts him. At one time it is a swelling current of such underlying depth and force that he who tries to stem it only courts disaster, at another it is the movement of surface waves, ruffled quickly into splash and spray, but significant of no enduring force beneath or behind, and sinking quickly back to calmness when the breeze is past.

¹ Address of the President of the Church Congress at Wolverhampton, Oct. 4, 1887; *Report*, p. 16. Similar testimony, even more remarkable, considering the region from which it comes, has been made public by the present Bishop of St. Asaph in his Primary Charge, Oct. 1890 (p. 5). “During the last five years,” he says, “out of 208 parishes in the Diocese, there are 94 parishes in which there has not been a single burial under Mr. Morgan’s Act; while there are thirty parishes with only one, and eighteen with only two. To speak quite plainly, the Act is, in this diocese, practically a dead letter.”

CHAPTER XXX.

RITUALISM AND ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

1878-1882.

RITUAL QUESTIONS IN THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE OF 1878—THE REVISED RUBRICS—SPEECH AT WESTBERE—CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE GOVERNMENT—ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS COMMISSION—MR. GREEN'S IMPRISONMENT—THE MACKONOCHE CORRESPONDENCE.

IT is necessary to return, although reluctantly, to the Ritual disputations which engrossed so much time and attention during the closing years of the Archbishop's life. The events of 1877 have been already described. Strange to say, the subject of Ritual was not re-opened in either House of Convocation during the following year (1878). It was the year of the Lambeth Conference, and one if not both parties in the controversy hoped for definite assistance to their cause when a hundred Bishops should come together from all parts of the world—unhampered, most of them, by any State-tied bonds—to discuss the Church's difficulties. It was decided by the English Church Union and other bodies that petitions should be forwarded to the Conference and pamphlets circulated among its members to inform them fully about the facts. Mrs. Monsell, who had been in close communication with Dr. Pusey and others, wrote thus to the Archbishop a few weeks before the great Conference met :—

"You are going to preside, my dearest Archbishop, over a band of men who have been called of God to an Apostolic

burden of authority. Among the great questions with which you will have to deal *must* be both Confession and Eucharistic Ritual. We can expect, and we do expect with confidence, that God the Holy Spirit will guide your deliberations, and on these great questions, as on others, what you say will come to us with the Lord's own stamp upon it, and we, your children, will receive and obey the message you deliver to us. May He grant you the wisdom and the power to heal our breaches, and to bring comfort to many burdened hearts! And surely, my dearest Archbishop, there will rest a special blessing upon your own grey hairs as you go bravely into this great *Synod* (though you won't let me call it so) encompassed with the sacred sorrow which is giving you every day a closer place in our hearts and in our prayers."

Not a few of the Bishops on coming to the Conference besought the Archbishop to keep out of its debates and Reports any reference either to Confession or to Ritual. "We shall only be proclaiming our irreconcilable differences," said a leading English Bishop, "and it will be impossible, without mischievous strife, to pass any resolutions whatever on these subjects." But the Archbishop was determined that, come what might, these subjects should find a place in the Bishops' joint utterance. He himself introduced them, first in the Committee over which he presided, and then in the Conference itself. The result, as regards Confession, has been described elsewhere;¹ and, with respect to Ritual, the following paragraph was adopted by the Hundred Bishops without one dissentient voice :—

"Considering unhappy disputes on questions of ritual, whereby divers congregations in the Church of England and elsewhere have been seriously disquieted, we desire to affirm the principle that no alteration from long accustomed ritual should be made contrary to the admonition of the Bishop of the diocese."

¹ See p. 169.

It was believed by many sanguine people that this very decided utterance, proceeding from such a source, would set the Ritual strifes at rest. When Convocation met in the following spring (1879) it was evident that no such hopes could be entertained. The time had now come when an answer of some sort must be returned to the Royal 'Letter of Business,' issued no less than seven years before; and the Archbishop, supported by many of his suffragans, determined to attempt, yet again, an amendment of the formidable Rubric. It had become perfectly evident that the 'Cope Compromise' suggested in the Lower House in 1877 would satisfy nobody;¹ and what the Archbishop now advocated was a simple enactment prescribing "surplice, stole, and hood," and "no other ornament unless it shall be otherwise ordered by a Canon of the Church lawfully enacted, promulged, and executed." His argument was to the effect that the Ornaments Rubric, taken by itself, seemed to enjoin the vestments as compulsory, but that, as nobody now regarded the enactment in that light, it was absurd to re-enact it, as had been suggested, precisely as it stood, with an addendum enjoining something quite different.

"Is there not an absurdity," he said, "in leaving the old words, which have been the subject of contention, to stare us in the face, followed by other words which say that they have no meaning? When we are called upon by 'Letters of Business' to clear away misconceptions, should we take a course calculated to continue misconceptions and confusion? . . . The rubric as proposed by our Committee is very simple. It merely says: The canons of the Church are to prevail. The custom of the Church of England for 300 years is to prevail. . . . We think it will be acceptable to the clergy that hereafter these matters shall be settled by strictly ecclesiastical authority, and therefore we

¹ This was accepted as a fact even by those who had been the promoters of the compromise; see *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1879, pp. 358, 360, etc.

propose to put in this limitation, 'Until further order shall be taken by a Canon of the Church.' We think it is a very important matter to take advantage of this opportunity to remove this subject of contention from the discussions which are necessarily involved in alterations of the statute law. We, therefore, wish that this matter shall be no longer a subject of the statute law at all, but that it shall be a matter of the Canons. We consider it is possible that the laity, as represented in Parliament, may look not unfavourably upon a proposal to leave such matters as the dress of the clergy to be settled hereafter by Canon. . . . I believe I may say that the laity are utterly tired of disputes upon such subjects, and that they desire that a body representing the Church of England shall be able to settle such questions for itself. I do not think you will find any jealousy on the part of the laity as to leaving matters of that kind hereafter to ecclesiastical legislation, such ecclesiastical legislation in an Established Church being necessarily, of course, controlled by the Royal Assent. Such is our proposal. We desire to be very explicit in the matter, not to leave any longer any ambiguity, and to have all such matters regulated in future by ecclesiastical authority."¹

The resolution thus advocated was accepted by the Bishops, but after full debate was decisively rejected in the Lower House, and it seemed as though an absolute deadlock had been reached. But the Archbishop, bent upon a further effort, insisted, in spite of opposition, in summoning a Conference of the two Houses, where he submitted a fresh resolution for the consideration of the Lower House, pressing upon its members with the utmost earnestness the duty of bringing the controversy, if possible, to an end. This new proposal, while it enjoined as the ordinary dress the surplice, stole, and hood, allowed by implication that other vestures might in particular cases be introduced, provided the Bishop of the diocese gave no monition to the contrary. This, the Archbishop

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, June 27, 1879, p. 203.

argued, was a much more workable arrangement than the suggestion of the Lower House that the previous consent of the Bishop should in all cases be required :—

“ . . . That is the proposal which we lay before the House ; and in doing so I desire to call your attention to what is not an unimportant fact : that this regulation now proposed with regard to a monition to prevent the introduction of other vestments than those here stated is based on a resolution of the hundred Bishops who met at Lambeth Palace last autumn. It is, as far as we understand it, a distinct embodiment of their resolution with regard to the ornaments of the minister. We are aware that a feeling exists in the minds of many persons, who are quite ready to listen to the spiritual monition of their fathers in God, of dislike that these monitions should only echo the decisions of the Courts. As this decision, however, was arrived at by one hundred Bishops, of whom the great majority were there simply in their Episcopal character, and in no way trammelled or controlled by any connection with the State, it will appear to be their opinion that this is a principle of the Church before it was connected with the State. With that explanation and account of the mode in which we arrived at our decision, we beg now to submit it to you for further consideration, being most anxious that this matter may be terminated in such a way as to promote the preservation of peace. The work of the Church is sorely impeded by these contentions. We are most anxiously desirous that the Church of Christ in this realm should more and more gird itself for that great contest with sin and infidelity for which it has been raised up. We ask you to adopt whatever may approve itself to your minds as likely to put an end to these unseemly strifes.”¹

The Archbishop's speech produced a strong and immediate impression upon the House, and he was supported in not less earnest tones by the Bishop of Lincoln. Dean Stanley characteristically explained his own attitude in the controversy :—

“ I cannot,” he said, “ engage in any serious argument in a

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, July 4, 1879, p. 393.

debate which appears to me—your lordships will excuse the word—so ludicrous. For seven years, Convocation, passing by many important reforms which are anxiously waited for by the Church, has been engaged on the subject of clergymen's clothes. . . . This disfigurement of the pages of the Prayer Book has been reserved for our time, and when we hear this spoken of as one of the essentials of religion, it shows to what a low pitch our religion has sunk. I have no wish to do more than call attention to this new and lamentable fact.”¹

A vigorous debate followed when the Bishops had withdrawn, and in the end, to the surprise of not a few, the Bishops' recommendation was accepted by the House, and formed part of the official report which Convocation now at length submitted to the Crown in reply to the 'Letter of Business' issued some years before. The document thus submitted was nothing less than a revised edition of the entire rubrics of the Prayer Book, accompanied, however, by a resolution deprecating any attempt to give legal force to the recommendations until such time as a new process of Church legislation should have become operative. It was easy for critics to complain of the inadequacy of the whole report, of its over-conservatism, and of the timidity which had been shown in dealing with such formidable difficulties as those attaching to the Athanasian Creed and the Ornaments Rubric. The Archbishop's action with respect to the former of these has been explained in a previous chapter. For the details of the Ornaments controversy he cared far less, and his letters are full of allusion to the inordinate number of hours consumed, or, as he sometimes said, wasted, in its consideration. Up to the last moment it seemed possible that everything might be shipwrecked upon this particular rock, and the avoidance of such a disaster was ascribed by general consent to the calmness, the

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, July 4, 1879, p. 399.

perseverance, and the skill which marked his leadership during the closing days of these long debates. A single letter may be quoted, from one of the Bishops least apt to be upon his side in ritual controversies :—

“But for the firmness your Grace has shown throughout this anxious week, we should have been in a very different position. I hear but one opinion as to the impression created by your earnest and fatherly words, and by your obvious desire to ‘make for peace’ without sacrificing principle. We who were behind the scenes know with what difficulties you had to contend throughout. I can honestly say I know of no one but your Grace who could have done it.”

His own Diary has the following :—

“*July 6, 1879.*—This week has been of incessant and anxious work in Convocation. I trust that by God’s blessing we have drawn up such an answer to the Letters of Business on Amendment of Rubrics as may help to the peace of the Church. . . . I thank God for what we have been able to do. I am certain all the Bishops have been led by one desire, to do what is most pleasing in His sight. Grant, Lord, that the result may be peace and holiness, and more earnest attention in the Church to the great central truths of our holy faith.”

“*Aug. 3, 1879.*—Days very full of work, culminating in an exciting meeting of both Houses for Conference. On the whole all ended well, and the Canterbury Convocation closed its many years’ labour by authorising me to sign the Report to the Crown. Some foolish people writing in the *Church Times*, etc., try to vilify and misrepresent our work, but I fully believe that we have done good service to the Church, and that henceforth no consistent High Churchman will be able to plead even a shadow of ecclesiastical authority when he disobeys the order of his Bishop, given in accordance with the law. Thank God for what we have been able to do. A letter from Hassard in his usual graphic style represents me as having been somewhat imperious in keeping the two Houses in order, but I think I did not do more than was absolutely required, and it was not in human nature not to be somewhat vehement.”

The utterance of Convocation, while pacificatory so far

as it went, was not, after all, of a very drastic or thorough-going character. Even the recommendations made were safeguarded by the proviso that they were not to be enacted under our present legislative system for Church matters, and the law therefore, with its attendant difficulties, remained, and still remains, exactly as it was before. The Archbishop had wished and worked for something more than this. But more seemed to be unattainable, and he therefore fell back upon the hope that the Resolutions of Convocation might receive more respect than the much-abused decisions of the Privy Council.

Unhappily the circumstances did not make for peace, and the enthusiastic litigants who had lavished money and courted abuse in defence of what they believed to be the cause of Protestant truth, were not inclined to rest satisfied with anything short of the fullest satisfaction that the law courts could be persuaded to provide. At no other period have so many separate cases been at once *sub judice*. In the north the prosecution of Mr. Green, to which so much attention was afterwards to be called, had already begun. In the South, at the very time when the Convocation Report was signed, Mr. Enraght of Bordesley, Mr. Mackonochie of St. Alban's, and Mr. Dale of St. Vedast's, were all before the Courts; and the Clewer case, disputing the Bishop of Oxford's right to veto the prosecution of Canon Carter, was still the subject of appeal.

Preparations for a General Election were on foot, and the Radical candidates in many parts of the country used the prevailing Church dissensions as a potent argument for Disestablishment. A leading High Churchman, a layman of position and influence, wrote to urge on the Archbishop the mischief which these arguments were doing. He added :—

"The temptation among High Churchmen is becoming stronger every day to make common cause with the Radical party at such a crisis in the Church's history, unless indeed the Bishops will make a formal and binding declaration that no further prosecutions are, on any account, to be allowed."

The Archbishop replied—

"I am convinced that the Bishops could not and ought not to give such an assurance as you desire. Surely the right course is for the persons you represent to state publicly that they are ready to place themselves in this matter in the hands of those set over them in the Lord. I cannot think that Churchmen who agree with you can feel any satisfaction in being supported by Mr. Chamberlain, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Labouchere, and Mr. Arch, even the most moderate of whom (and I have no reason but your letter for mentioning their names together) would openly avow that the existence of such a Church as you desire—to say nothing of an Established Church—is the very last thing they are anxious to secure. Conscientious Radicals may desire to see a small mediæval sect take its place amongst other sects, but a Catholic Church such as you are devoted to they would never desire to see flourishing in a prominent and powerful position. I think, therefore, it is very dangerous for those who agree with you to put themselves into the hands of the Radical party as you imply they are now doing."

A few months later, the General Election, and Mr. Gladstone's triumphant return to power, gave men other things to think about than ecclesiastical disputation, and no sooner was the new Government in office than the Burials Bill, to which a chapter has already been devoted, absorbed the attention of Churchmen. But the flames of the Ritual controversy blazed afresh when, in the autumn of 1880, Mr. Pelham Dale, of St. Vedast's, was, at the instance of his churchwardens, committed to Holloway prison for disobedience to the inhibition which had issued from the Court of Arches. An equally violent course would probably have been taken in the case of

Mr. Mackonochie, had not Mr. Martin expressed his intention to withdraw from the prosecution rather than become a party to such a step. The Archbishop expressed, in the strongest terms, his disapproval of the action taken by the churchwardens of St. Vedast's—"a course calculated," he said, "to retard, if not to defeat, all our hopes and efforts after peace." But he was speaking to deaf ears. Mr. Dale's imprisonment was followed by Mr. Enraght's, and the English Church Union seized the propitious moment for recommending the immediate and general adoption of the disputed vestments.¹ What specially distressed the Archbishop was the issue by partisan societies, on either side, of a host of circulars and placards of the same inflammatory or derisive character as had been used a few months before with reference to the Burials Act. Packets of such papers used to arrive at Lambeth every week. A huge broad-sheet, for pasting upon walls and hoardings, ran as follows:—

THE VICTORIAN PERSECUTION.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF.

- B. C. 533. Three Jews cast into a Fiery Furnace for conscience' sake.
- 583. Daniel cast into the Den of Lions for conscience' sake.
- A. D. 28. S. John Baptist cast into prison for conscience' sake.
- 32. Our Blessed Lord Crucified to vindicate "the Law."
- 51. SS. Peter and John cast into Prison for Preaching Christ.
- 55. S. Stephen stoned to death for conscience' sake.
- 68. SS. Peter and Paul put to death for conscience' sake.
- 1555. Hooper, Ridley, and Latimer burned for conscience' sake.
- 1556. Cranmer burnt for conscience' sake.
- 1876. Arthur Tooth imprisoned for conscience' sake.
- 1880. T. Pelham Dale, R. W. Enraght, imprisoned for conscience' sake, and

They are in Gaol now, in this year 1880 of our Lord, and 43rd of Victoria, and, by God's Grace, may they light such a candle as shall never be put out.

¹ See the recommendation of the Council of E.C.U. in *The Guardian*, Nov. 10, 1880, p. 1552.

The conflict seemed to grow fiercer and more clamorous every day, and the battle-smoke was so confusing, and the local skirmishes so various, that it was difficult for the general combatants on either side to gain a clear idea either of the adversaries' position or of their own.

The very weariness of the strife seemed to the Archbishop to justify him in asking for a reconsideration or a restatement of the actual points of difference, and to this end he took the opportunity of a Ruridecanal Conference, at Westbere in the Isle of Thanet,¹ to make a speech which attracted wide attention, and which is sometimes referred to, it is hard to see why, as marking a new departure in his Church policy.

"The questions now at issue," he said, "have reference on the one hand to the independence of the Church and the Christian conscience, and, on the other, to the controlling power which every well-ordered State must exercise over all bodies, ecclesiastical or other, which exist within its dominions. These questions are extremely grave. The whole history of England, and, indeed, of all other civilised countries, shows their gravity. No Church, established or unestablished, no body of men associated for any religious purpose, can claim to have any property secured to it, or to have any rights and liberties, unless it is willing to submit itself in many matters to the controlling power of the civil Government which protects it. The exact form in which this control is to be exercised over Churches, either those which are called free, or those which enjoy a well-regulated independence under the protection of the State, is a fair subject for discussion and controversy. I believe myself that the history of England shows that if we wish real reasonable liberty both for clergy and laity, and security for minorities, we shall find it in such arrangements as the great statutes of the English Reformation sanctioned rather than in any other scheme. How far these statutes have been adhered to in practice age after age is a fair subject for discussion in our Reformed Church. But what I wish to direct attention to is this—that while we have many and discordant

¹ On December 14, 1880.

attacks made on our present system of ecclesiastical legislation and judicature, no one that I am aware of has come forward, as representing those who are dissatisfied, to advocate a scheme of practicable reform such as appears likely to command the general assent of our clergy and laity. I know, my reverend brethren, that you agree with me that nothing in such matters is to be gained by violence either of action or of speech. What I wish to commend to all who are agitated by recent events is this : that they should calmly ask themselves definitely what they want. The answer cannot be the short and easy one, that they desire all intricate questions of law and procedure to be decided according to their personal wishes. If they are anxious for certain important changes in our existing constitution let them state explicitly what they are, and they may rest assured that their suggestions will be respectfully and calmly considered. . . . The present form of our highest Court of Appeal was adopted within the last ten years in deference to what were then supposed to be the wishes of the leaders of what is called the High Church party. If there is anything faulty in it, by all means let it be amended. All true Churchmen, desirous that the Church of England should fulfil its heavenly mission, will, I feel confident, endeavour to allay any excitement which is around them, and, if they find that strong feelings have been aroused, will apply themselves, in a quiet spirit of prayer, to consider whether any changes ought for the Church's highest welfare to be made, and, if so, what they are."

There can be no question that this speech did much to clear the air. High Churchmen all over the country wrote to thank him for what he had said, and to make a statement of their doubts and difficulties. A Memorial presented to him by the Dean of St. Paul's, with the signatures of nearly 5000 clergy,¹ was perhaps more serviceable than these individual and sometimes very discordant letters. The Memorial was as follows :—

¹ Most of these were sent in after the Memorial had been transmitted to the Archbishop and made public. The original document was signed by the Deans of St. Paul's, Durham, Manchester, Worcester, and York, Canons Liddon, King, Stubbs, Gregory, and twenty-three others.

To His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"Jany. 10, 1881.

"Your Grace has been pleased to invite those of the Clergy who feel dissatisfied or alarmed at the present circumstances of the Church, to state what they desire, in the way of remedy. Encouraged by this invitation, we venture to submit to your Grace the following suggestions:—

"First of all, and especially, we would respectfully express our desire for a distinctly avowed policy of toleration and forbearance, on the part of our ecclesiastical superiors, in dealing with questions of Ritual. Such a policy appears to us to be demanded alike by justice and by the best interests of religion. For justice would seem to require that, unless a rigid observance of the Rubrical Law of the Church, or of recent interpretations of it, be equally exacted from all the parties within her pale, it should no longer be exacted from one party alone, and under circumstances which often increase the difficulty of complying with the demand. And, having regard to the uncertainties which have been widely thought to surround some recent interpretations of ecclesiastical law, as well as to the equitable claims of congregations placed in the most dissimilar religious circumstances, we cannot but think that the recognised toleration of even wide diversities of ceremonial is alone consistent with the interests of true religion, and with the well-being of the English Church at the present time.

"The immediate need of our Church is, in our opinion, a tolerant recognition of divergent Ritual practice; but, we feel bound to submit to your Grace that our present troubles are likely to recur, unless the Courts by which ecclesiastical causes are decided, in the first instance and on appeal, can be so constructed as to secure the conscientious obedience of clergymen who believe the constitution of the Church of Christ to be of divine appointment; and who protest against the State's encroachment upon rights, assured to the Church of England by solemn Acts of Parliament. We do not presume to enter into details upon a subject confessedly surrounded with great difficulties; but content ourselves with expressing an earnest hope that it may receive the attention of your Grace and of the Bishops of the Church of England.—We are, your Grace's very obedient servants,

R. W. CHURCH, Dean of S. Paul's."

[And thirty-one others.]

A counter Memorial immediately followed, with an almost equal number of signatures,¹ the Memorialists entreating the Archbishop "to give no countenance to any attempt to procure toleration for ritual practices which for more than 300 years, and until a very recent date, were almost unknown in the Church of England, and which, when submitted to the highest Courts, have been declared to be contrary to the laws of the Church and Realm." "As regards the constitution of the Ecclesiastical Courts," the Memorialists continued, "we beg to assure your Grace, without expressing dissatisfaction with the existing arrangements, that any alterations really calculated to improve them will always receive our ready acquiescence."

At least one third of the clergy of the Church of England must have signed one or other of these Memorials. It was necessary, as always, to notice the names which were absent, as well as those which were appended to the rival lists, and no small proportion of the thousands who declined to sign expressed their views to the Archbishop by letter. The condition of his letter-baskets during the opening weeks of 1881 has an imperishable place in the recollection of his secretaries.

The letters were of all kinds—including many like the following, addressed to the Archbishop's chaplain by a friend, a well-known parish priest of singular devotion :—

"I have been rather disturbed in my mind by the Memorial for toleration and the Counter-Memorial, as I was afraid it looked as if parties were defining their lines very sharply, and one would be driven to 'take a side.' I was half persuaded to sign the Counter-Memorial, but on reflection I felt sure that such a document as the Memorial itself would be estimated just at its right value by the Archbishop. He was not likely to suppose

¹ The list was headed by Bishops Perry and Ryan, and by the Deans of Canterbury, Exeter, Carlisle, Ripon, Chester, Gloucester, and Peterborough.

that the number of clergy who signed the Counter-Memorial represented the whole number who disliked the other. He would know that there must be a great number of men who prefer not entering into a contest until there is something really tangible and important to fight about. When I read the Archbishop's speeches, I cannot express how thankful I am for the wisdom and gentleness and spirituality that is manifest in them. It does seem to me a cause for real thankfulness and even for some surprise that he should be able, in the very midst of all the tumult and controversy, to keep so steadily in view the highest spiritual interests of the Church *and Nation*, pestered as he must be, day after day, with clamorous appeals on foolish and unlearned questions. We country parsons get greatly excited over them—to the detriment of our parish work. We take our views almost entirely from the *Church Times* or the *Record*, and we all without a single exception become so confused, directly we talk on these matters, that whatever views are expressed are perfectly vague, if not unintelligible. . . .”

A few extracts from the Archbishop's own Diary during these weeks of Church excitement will show how he succeeded throughout in maintaining his interest in other matters, undistracted by the controversy in which he was so deeply engaged, and able as ever, to draw courage and inspiration from the very sorrows which might have crushed or incapacitated him.

Diary.

“STONEHOUSE, *Sunday before Advent, Nov. 21, 1880.*—A quiet week here, diversified by the variety of letters to be answered. To-day I have ordained M. —, who was too young for the Diaconate last September when he was examined. Also W. —, Fellow and Bursar and Lecturer of — College, Oxford. I was cheered by a serious conversation I had with him yesterday evening about the religious condition of Oxford. The fact is, the place is neither much better nor much worse than the world around it. The influences at work amongst young men in London are at work at the University, and there is much to be

said for the belief that the open scepticism distinctly avowed by many gives on the whole more seriousness to those who resist its influence. Little C. —, who is M. —'s pupil, came over with his father yesterday. A dear little boy. Curious to think what the world will have come to—religiously, intellectually, socially, and politically—by the time he is grown to be an old man. Dismal and desponding letters from Ireland. The Bishop of Limerick writes to-day as if the whole Irish nation were going to the mischief, and the Government utterly regardless. . . .”

“*Advent Sunday, Nov. 28th.*—The second anniversary of the death of my beloved. . . . I have seemed all last evening and to-day to see her laid low on that bed in dear James's house, and have heard again all she said, and have brought back her look of weakness yet so full of love. Oh, it was a short leave-taking after a hallowed union of thirty-five years! O God, enable me to pass the time that still remains as ever near her, and Craufurd, and the loved little sisters, and, if near them, near to Thee. Knollys has sent me from King Edward's First Prayer Book a prayer for the dead. For these, thank God, I need none; I know God has taken their purified souls to be with Jesus in Paradise, and it needs no prayer from earth to secure or deepen their blessed rest in Christ. I do not know how I should feel if I had lost a child or wife of whose meetness at death to be with Christ I had any doubt. O Lord, I thank Thee for the purity of those who have left me in the Faith of Christ. It is very touching to see the Orphanage and its bright inmates, and the Convalescent Home, and to think of her blessed work so well continued.”

“*STONEHOUSE, Dec. 5, 1880.*—Last week, from Monday to Saturday, Randall and I were kindly received in the Deanery at Westminster by the Dean and Lady Frances. Each day heavy work, but very interesting. Dear Woollcombe's death, a friend of forty years. . . . At spare moments I have been reading *Endymion*, and I confess to being much interested, though more in watching the phenomenon of the old Prime Minister pouring forth his thoughts and experiences in a novel, than in any real attractiveness of the story. Wednesday was the 1st December. A sad day indeed. I am glad to be back with my little girls. To-day we have had the Communion at St. Peter's, and I have given an afternoon sermon,

and a short address at the Orphanage. Yesterday I wrote a long letter to an old clergyman in Cornwall, distracted by the imprisonment of Dale and Enraght. I shall be glad if to-morrow we find Dale at large, under the writ of Habeas Corpus. . . .”

“STONEHOUSE, *3d Sunday in Advent, 12th Dec.*—Went to London on Monday forenoon. At Lambeth a meeting for Père Hyacinthe’s Mission in France. Settled mode of action. Then to Fulham to stay two nights with the Bishop. On Tuesday, from 11—6, at London House, for great meeting of Bishops, twenty-two present. . . . Imprisonment of Dale, etc. Only one opinion possible as to the unwisdom of those who have forced on this imprisonment . . . [yet] if men are resolved to set the law at naught, they must sooner or later feel the weight of its arm. . . . The wisdom of the Bishops is to show kindly consideration for all their clergy. . . . In the North [there seems to be] a determination in the great mass of religious people to resist all things which seem to them to be tampering with Popery. . . . There is an excellent article on the state of things generally in the *Guardian* of this week. . . . We had a pleasant gathering in the house at Fulham. Edie and I went to see the new church, and visited some of our old people in the Almshouses, and the survivor of the four Miss Kings. There were only two people in the Almshouses who were our friends. . . . I have finished *Endymion* with a painful feeling that the writer considers all political life as mere play and gambling. Thursday was dear mother’s birthday. We are all together, and quite alone, enjoying ‘the bosom of the family.’ To-day, Holy Communion in the Parish Church. I addressed the children at the afternoon service.”

“ADDINGTON, *4th Sunday in Advent, Dec. 19.*—Back here. On Tuesday last, a great gathering of all the clergy of the Isle of Thanet. An address to them on present difficulties, which I had prepared the day before, and which has gone the round of the newspapers.¹ This was before we entered on the business of our meeting, which was chiefly of a devotional character. . . . The rest of the week spent in the ordinary routine of business and some reading; the newspapers, on the state of Ireland, occupying a considerable portion of time. . . .”

¹ See p. 423.

"ADDINGTON, *Sunday, Dec. 26.*—This week my birthday: sixty-nine. Opened Nurses' Home at Croydon, with address on Wednesday. Consecrated new Chancel at S. James's, Croydon, on Thursday. Bishop Scott of North China and the Bishop of North Queensland here. Also the Master of Balliol and John Hassard. Much curious and interesting talk with the Master of Balliol. He has a strange mind. It is amusing to note how entirely uninterested he is on all the peculiar subjects now exercising the clerical mind. He lives in a region of critical and metaphysical theology apart by himself. I have been receiving this week many suggestions in answer to what I said in Westbere Deanery. One says: 'Restore the First Prayer Book of Edward vi.' that is, in plain English, 'Repeal all the Acts of Uniformity.' Another says: 'Abolish all existing Courts, and establish Courts of Bishops and Clergy,' and another: 'Let Diocesan Synods decide all cases.' 'There is no use doing anything,' says another, 'till the Church appoints her own Bishops'—whatever that may mean. 'Follow,' says another, 'the wise example of the Scottish Episcopal Church, where everything is decided by a Synod of Bishops. Nothing can be more peaceable and harmonious, for did not this Synod contain that noble High Church divine Bishop Forbes, and at the same time that eccentric Broad Churchman Bishop Ewing?' The writer forgets that the first of these divines was condemned and censured by this harmonious Synod, and that Bishop Ewing was perpetually harassed by threats of condemnation, from which nothing but his personal popularity and influence among the laity, especially in England, saved him. Some of these suggestions are sent to me privately. Others are ventilated in the *Guardian* and elsewhere. The most sensible seems to me that of the Dean of Durham, who says, in effect, 'Let the Bishops resolve to be very careful, considerate and tender in their dealings with Ritualists.' Meanwhile it is a comfort to know that . . . Mr. Dale is out of prison, and Mr. Enraght might have been so too, had he not preferred to stay in, rather than appear—even in the slightest degree—to sanction the existence of Lord Penzance and the Judicial Committee. This week fuel has been added to the flames. . . . These matters make this Christmas very anxious. Still more so does Ireland. Out of the difficulties into which the Government has brought us in that matter, I see no escape. . . . Christmas must now always to all of

us be a solemn time. The memorial window¹ in our little parish church is exactly opposite where I sit, and I greatly enjoy it. . . ."

"*Jan. 2, 1881.*—The state of Church matters occupies my mind. I am to see Gladstone and the Chancellor to-morrow in reference to the bill proposed by Convocation. Surely the condition both of Church and State imposes a heavy burden on the rulers of both. In Ireland there is no improvement. . . . The dear old Bishop of St. John's, Kaffraria, has been visiting us this week ; full of interesting things in his missionary experience. . . ."

"*First Sunday after Epiphany, Jan. 9. 1881.*—This week we have had Canon Carter staying with us. I was very anxious to have a full talk with him as representing the High Church party. I think if he and I had to settle the present difficulties there would be no great commotion. . . . I have had two letters from George Denison, full of expressions of personal kindness, but enclosing a hopeless sort of pamphlet.

"On Monday I went to Downing Street for an interview with the Prime Minister and the Chancellor on the present state of ecclesiastical affairs. They both decisively discouraged the bringing in of the bill for giving legislative or quasi-legislative force to the decisions of Convocation. They said they had so much on hand that they could not encumber *themselves* with such matters, and could not even give effective support to such a bill brought in by me. To my suggestion . . . that it would be well to issue a Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Judicature they gave a not unwilling attention, and led me to think that the proposal would be favourably considered, suggesting that I might move in the House of Lords for such a Commission. Meanwhile my letter to Wilkinson² has appeared in the *Guardian* . . . with a view of letting all dissatisfied persons understand that we are quite ready to consider all their complaints or grievances, and seek a remedy. . . . I found the Bishop of Peterborough full of a similar proposal to that which I had made to the ministers. It seems to me at present that we shall do all that can be done in the way of conciliation if the Bishops repeat their assurances given to the Lower House of Convocation in 1879³—and the reform of the Ecclesiastical

¹ Erected by the Parishioners to the memory of Mrs. Tait.

² See p. 436.

³ See pp. 417-419.

Courts is thoroughly examined—and Convocation has an addition made to it of more members representing the parochial clergy. The Bishop of Peterborough added an important consideration: namely, that if a Royal Commission be now issued, the Bishops would be justified in maintaining the *status quo* till it had reported, allowing meanwhile no fresh prosecutions for past changes, and insisting no new changes be allowed. . . .

“The opening of Parliament and the debate that day mark a crisis in public affairs respecting Ireland. Dizzy was scarcely himself physically, otherwise he was effective. There was a very meagre attendance of Bishops, not above four, and our brother of — actually took the oath and left the House before five. The House was crowded with lay peers.

“On Friday before I left London I had my meeting [at Lambeth] . . . with some twenty religiously-minded scientific men. We formed a committee to encourage efforts to influence the public through the press. I am hopeful that good will follow. . . .

“I was preaching again to-day on New Year’s changes. Lord, enable me to have my own soul fixed on Christ, the unchangeable, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. We have much need for something changeless to rest upon in these changeful and very anxious times.”

Two of the letters alluded to in the foregoing extracts from his Diary ought to be quoted here. To the old clergyman in Cornwall he had written—

“Usually I have answered those who have forwarded to me the stereotyped resolution of the English Church Union on the subject of Mr. Dale’s imprisonment, by simply referring them to my printed letter to the choir-master of St. Vedast’s, in which I stated my disapproval of the application to the Court of Arches for imprisonment under the Act of George III. . . . I also pointed out that if Mr. Dale objected, however unreasonably, to the authority of the Court of Arches as now constituted, and to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, he still ought not, according to any intelligible Church principles, to have refused to obey his Bishop; but ought to have bowed to the Episcopal admonition, according to the decision of the Pro-

vincial Synod of Canterbury, and the advice of the hundred Bishops assembled at Lambeth.

"The kindly and considerate tone of your letter encourages me, however, to go further in my answer to you.

"In my recent Charge I have stated my view of the duty of the clergy in this matter, in pp. 20-30, and to these I will refer you. And I will now call your attention to a further point.

"The present constitution of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council having authority in matters ecclesiastical dates from the passing of the Judicature Act, when Mr. Gladstone was last Prime Minister, some seven years ago. At that time the constitution of the Court was materially altered to meet the expressed wishes of those who are now represented by the leaders of what is called the High Church party. The late Bishop of Winchester and others who sympathised with him had often urged that the Court ought to be reconstituted on the principle of excluding the Bishops from being actual judges, though their advice might be sought as assessors. The opponents of the then existing Judicial Committee contended that what they objected to was the mixed character of the Court, and they maintained or allowed that it was strictly in accordance with ecclesiastical usage, that there should be, as in the Gallican Church, an appeal to the Crown *comme d'abus*. It was, of course, conceded by them, as it must be by any reasonable man, that the civil power must in all churches, whether established or disestablished, have a right to interfere in all questions which, however indirectly, affect property—in buildings and salaries, the civil status of their ministers, and the like. Accordingly, a great concession was made and the constitution of the Court altered. I confess I always had my fears that the new Court would not be more popular than the old with the party who thus called for this change, unless it should turn out that its decisions were in their favour; and I am sorry to say that experience has confirmed my apprehension; and I do not believe that any form of Court, dealing either with matters ecclesiastical or civil, whether consisting of ecclesiastics or of laymen, or of a mixed body of both, will ever be popular with any set of ecclesiastical partisans against whom it may decide.

"Nevertheless, if the experiment made seven years ago with the view of meeting the wishes of High Churchmen can be amended, by all means let it be so; only let us proceed in a

regular and law-abiding way. Let any one who wishes to see another form of the final Court of Appeal set forth clearly the change which he advocates. Let him secure that some influential member of Convocation and of Parliament, who approves of the contemplated change, shall avail himself of the constitutional means of proposing it for acceptance by the authorities of the Church and the Realm. I think I can undertake for the general body of English Churchmen that whatever Court is constitutionally appointed its decisions will by them be loyally accepted.

"You allude to certain rumours, which after all are nothing more than floating gossip, as to how the numbers of the Judicial Committee were divided in a recent case, and what an eminent Counsel, now deceased, is supposed to have said in conversation, as I understand, with a certain Archdeacon; but I am sure you do not mean deliberately to charge the eminent persons who compose the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council with violating their oaths as Councillors, and presenting to the Queen a decision on points of law which their consciences disapproved. Yet you use words which might be construed as implying that, when asked distinctly what is the law in this case, the present and late Lord Chancellor, and the majority of the Court who acted with them, after consultation with their Episcopal Assessors, deliberately substituted policy for justice. I am sure you cannot mean this.

"I cannot but think that on full consideration of what I have now brought before you, you will use your influence with your brother clergy to induce them to view this question in its right aspect, and to be guided by the moderating influence of their Bishops in these distressing and difficult questions.

"I enclose a copy of my Charge, that you may verify the reference I have given you, and shall feel obliged by your accepting it.—Believe me to be, my dear Sir, yours very faithfully,
A. C. CANTUAR."

To another clergyman whose Ritual troubles had been very serious, and who wrote at great length upon the subject, the Archbishop replied:—

"Judging from the letters which you have forwarded to me I am reluctantly compelled to come to the conclusion that you

have for the last seven years and a half been acting in distinct contravention of the express admonition and entreaty of the Bishop of your diocese, as regards the conduct of Divine service in your parish church. The troubles in which you are involved are, as it seems to me, the result of this line of action, and great as is the influence which your pamphlet shows that you have acquired in your parish, I cannot but think that a yet better influence, extending to all your parishioners, might by God's blessing have been obtained by you had you listened to the Bishop's admonitions. . . . You ask for my blessing on yourself and your parishioners. I pray God to grant to you and them a right judgment in all things, and that whatever be the issue of the present distressing position of affairs amongst you, you may have the guidance and comfort of the Holy Spirit through our Lord⁷ Jesus Christ."

The following correspondence explains itself :—

Canon G. H. Wilkinson to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"ST. PETER'S VICARAGE,
GROSVENOR GARDENS, S.W.
29 Dec. 1880.

"MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—Thank you for your kind message received through Mr. Davidson. After some days' consideration I think that I may without presumption look upon that message as justifying me in writing to your Grace with a freedom which, without such an invitation, would have been impertinent. I do not ask for 'a promise to be officially given that the Bishops are prepared to reconsider the present relations of Church and State.' I am sorry I used that phrase, and I quite see the force of Davidson's objection to it. What I ask is that in some informal way (such perhaps as a short note to some friend, to be published by him in the *Guardian*) your Grace should give an assurance that you would yourself direct the attention of the Bishops to the alleged grievances of the Church, and ask them at once to investigate them. . . . I write to your Grace because it is well known that it rests practically with you what is done or not done by the Upper House of Convocation. . . . We all know that if you can say a few kind

words to the effect, that though you do not agree with the speeches that you have read, and cannot get any expression of united opinion as to what is wanted, still you respect the evident earnestness of many who are disturbed about the alleged grievances of the Church, and that the first work of the Bishops in Convocation shall (so far as you have influence) be a calm and thorough investigation of these grievances. Then I believe that hundreds would thank God and take courage, and persevere in silent obedience to those who are set over them. . . .—And believe that I am, yours most respectfully,

“GEORGE H. WILKINSON.”

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Canon Wilkinson.

“ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
Dec. 31, 1880.

“MY DEAR CANON WILKINSON,—Let me thank you for your letter of the 29th, yesterday received. You may feel confident that I, in common with all the Bishops, am as anxious as you can be that full consideration should be given to existing difficulties in the Church, and to the best mode of removing them.

“It is a peculiarity of the present troubles that the clergymen who have fallen under the penalties of the law, in a way we all much regret, have come under the authority of the provincial courts of Canterbury and York as the result of their having positively refused to conform to the admonition of their Bishops, and, indeed, so far as I know, no case of prosecution for ritual has (at least for many years past) been allowed to proceed in the case of any clergyman who was willing to comply with such admonition. It certainly may fairly be taken to show that there must be some exceptional difficulty in present arrangements, when clergymen of otherwise unimpeachable character think it their duty to run the risk of having their usefulness in their parishes rudely interrupted by the authority of the law rather than yield, to those set over them in the Lord, that degree of willing obedience which seems to most men to be enjoined alike by the traditions of their Church and by the written words of the Prayer Book (in the Preface ‘concerning the service of the Church’), as well as by their promise of canonical obedience.

"I am quite sure I may undertake for my brethren of the Episcopate that we are ready very carefully to consider, at the present juncture, the grounds which appear to have led to so strange a result. . . . I can have no hesitation in assuring you that—while, of course, I cannot approve of much that has been said and written (often, I presume, under excitement) in the present controversy, and while I have been unable as yet to obtain any authoritative expression of united opinion as to what is wanted—still I cannot but respect the evident earnestness of many who are disturbed as to the alleged grievances which attach to our present condition.

"So far as I have any influence, the first work to which the Bishops will be called in Convocation shall be a calm and thorough investigation of these grievances.—Believe me to be, my dear Canon Wilkinson, yours very truly,

"A. C. CANTUAR."

The Archbishop had thus definitely pledged himself to a reconsideration of the points at issue in the Church, and of the grievances, real and imaginary, of the High Church party. To bring this about, in a satisfactory manner, the co-operation of the Government was essential, and he had accordingly been for some time in communication with the leading members of the Cabinet. About a fortnight before his Westbere speech he had summoned a special meeting of the Bishops to discuss the subject.¹

Fortified by the general approval with which his suggestions were received, he at once approached the Prime Minister with two distinct requests. He urged, in the first place, that legal effect should be given to the Convocation Scheme for enacting what he called 'Ecclesiastical Byelaws,' and, secondly, that a Royal Commission should investigate the Condition and History of the Ecclesiastical Courts. The former of these requests he

¹ See above, p. 429.

embodied, for the consideration of the Government, in the following important Memorandum, which he sent to the Lord Chancellor:—

Memorandum on Ritual Difficulties.

“ LAMBETH PALACE, Dec. 16, 1880.

“ It is not unnaturally desired that there shall be as little interference as possible with the Ritual in churches the parishioners of which are satisfied, and where hearty work is being done in connection with an advanced and somewhat florid service, even though in some respects the law prescribed by the Acts of Uniformity is stretched beyond its proper limits.

“ Let it be remembered that all the cases which have caused so much discussion during the last few weeks are, I believe, old cases, originated before the highest Court of Appeal affirmed the power of the Bishops to stop proceedings in all cases if, like the Bishop of Oxford, they were willing to take upon themselves the full responsibility of saying that, for the peace of the Church, the case ought not to go on. Also they all, I believe, originated before Convocation, following the advice of the 100 Bishops at Lambeth, affirmed that no clergyman was justified in introducing a departure from long-established Ritual against the monition of his Bishop. And I believe in Mr. Carter's, and even in Mr. Enraght's, case, there are not wanting proofs that this decision of Convocation, rightly used, will enable Bishops to arrange for the modification of objectionable Ritual, and the appeasing of all difficulties. This decision of Convocation is embodied in the addition to the Ornaments Rubric, recommended in answer to the Queen's letters of business.

“ Now it appears to me that, if this Rubric suggested by Convocation were adopted, all confusion might hereafter be avoided. I have myself stopped already more than one case of intended prosecution (not in my own diocese only, but in instances in which I was called to act for a Patron Bishop), and I feel confident that this power would be used in all suitable cases if the Bishops' hands were strengthened by their authority being thus recognised in the Rubric. Of course there might be a mere partisan Bishop, but this is very unlikely. The good sense of somebody must be trusted, and I believe there is better chance

of fair and wise exemption from the enforcement of strict Ritual by trusting the Bishop than by trusting any one else.

"Then comes the question, How can such a Rubric be obtained without disturbance? It has already passed out of the hands of Convocation, and been recommended to the Queen in answer to the letters of business. But Convocation has already recommended that such matters so sanctioned, being approved by the Queen, should be laid before Parliament, and, if not opposed within a certain time, should take effect, like Orders in Council sent up from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Might not the consent of Parliament be obtained for such a mode of enacting ecclesiastical byelaws? No one proposes that Parliament should abdicate its right of initiating direct legislation where it thought well directly and primarily to interfere. The analogous power vested in the Ecclesiastical Commission and other similar bodies in no way interferes with the full right of Parliament to initiate when it pleases. I feel confident that in the suggestions I have thus made is to be found the true solution of present difficulties. The clergy would be satisfied that Convocation was listened to, and I think they would soon come gladly to leave themselves in the hands of the Bishops, who have shown no desire to interfere unnecessarily with the wishes of congregations, and certainly not of parishes."

The following extracts from the correspondence which ensued will show that the Memorandum did not meet with a very encouraging reception from the high authorities to whom it was sent :—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Mr. Gladstone.

"STONEHOUSE, Dec. 16, 1880.

"MY DEAR MR. GLADSTONE,—You kindly gave me to understand at the end of the summer that you would give attention before the next session of Parliament to the Return made by Convocation to the letters of business on Ritual matters.

"I know what important matters of a different character press on your attention; but Church difficulties are at present serious, and I venture to ask you to read a memorandum which

I have sent to the Lord Chancellor on these subjects. The upshot of the memorandum is that the solution of great difficulties may be found in following the recommendations made by Convocation in answer to the Queen's letters of business.—Believe me to be, my dear Mr. Gladstone, sincerely yours,

“A. C. CANTUAR.”

Mr. Gladstone to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“HAWARDEN CASTLE, CHESTER,
Dec. 18, 1880.

“MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—. . . I have not forgotten the pledge given at the end of the last session.

“It would perhaps be foreign to the purpose, and yet more probably not within the power of the Government at this present arduous juncture, to become a party to the handling of any controversial matter within the Church; but I am sure they would wish well to every pacific effort of its authorities.

“I shall read with great interest and respect the memorandum to the Lord Chancellor when it reaches me, and I remain, your Grace's most faithfully and sincerely,

“W. E. GLADSTONE.”

The Lord Chancellor to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“30 PORTLAND PLACE, W.
Dec. 18, 1880.

“MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,—. . . Whatever I might have thought about the Convocation scheme, which you seem to consider the only available remedy for our present disorders, if it were possible to dissociate it from the pretensions of a large body of the clergy to reject Parliamentary legislation in ecclesiastical matters as not binding on their consciences, and to carry that principle to the length of organised disturbance to law, I think it would be wholly impossible at the present time (I mean impossible in a Parliamentary and practical sense) to dissociate it from those pretensions.

“The organisation for this purpose numbers among its members 2500 clergy, including some of the persons of the

greatest moral power and influence in the Church. They ask nothing less than to reduce the Royal supremacy within limits utterly unknown in this country since the Reformation, and inconsistent with the plain meaning of Statutes, Canons, and Articles, as well as with the practice of centuries. In the face of such a movement, to ask Parliament to abate one iota of its present legislative powers in ecclesiastical matters, or to concede any degree of power beyond what they now possess to the Convocations, seems to me not only impracticable, but very difficult to defend in Parliament. No party in the State can be expected to give it any support,—neither those who agree with Lord Shaftesbury and Mr. Newdegate, nor those who agree with Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Cairns, nor the Whigs (always jealous of Convocation), nor the Dissenters and Radicals, whose aim is Disestablishment, who hail with delight the practical accession to their ranks of the followers of Mr. Keble and Dr. Pusey, and who are at all events powerful enough to make a reconstruction of the relation of Church and State, upon the principle of giving more power to the clergy and less to the laity, impossible in our day.—Believe me ever, my dear Archbishop, yours very sincerely,
SELBORNE."

Mr. Gladstone to the Lord Chancellor.

"HAWARDEN CASTLE, CHESTER,
Dec. 22, 1880.

"MY DEAR SELBORNE,—I have read the Archbishop's memorandum with much interest, and, to prevent a triangular correspondence, it may be well that for the present I should answer through you.

"In the first place it is right and pleasant to say that it is evidently drawn in a wise and considerate spirit, and shows a desire to make allowance for the feelings and habits of parishioners, as also of congregations who ought, in certain cases, to be considered more or less apart from parishioners.

"As I understand the matter, the recommendation of Convocation about the Ornaments Rubric (which I have not at hand) is conditional on the adoption of a method for allowing secondary legal authority to the decisions of Convocation arrived at in a certain manner.

"If there is any man alive who could procure the adoption of such a plan it is the Archbishop. The thing certainly could not be done by the authority of the Cabinet, were the Cabinet disposed to use it, of which I can at present say nothing.

"Apart, however, from idle jealousies, there is, I think, at least one real difficulty in the case. In the House of Lords it would be practically open to any member of the body to raise the question during the time while the Canon or Ordinance, whatever it was, would lie on the table. But in the House of Commons it would not, unless the subject were urgent, and no subject would be deemed urgent, it is to be feared, except in connection with a more or less hostile feeling.

"I think the Archbishop's idea of trusting on the one hand to the moderation of the Bishops, and on the other to the general disposition of the clergy to obey them, is a very good one, but a difficulty seems to arise on the *tack*.

"Do you think it might be well if the Archbishop, you, and I, were to meet together in London for a friendly conversation as to this matter after the Cabinet reassembles (on the 30th)?—
Yours sincerely,
W. E. GLADSTONE.

"P.S.—The proposal with which I close is put down in deference to the Archbishop's desire, and with the feeling that he may be able to propose some expedient."

The Lord Chancellor to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"BLACKMOOR, PETERSFIELD,
Dec. 24, 1880.

"MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,—I enclose Mr. Gladstone's note to me (in effect, to yourself also) on the subject of your last 'memorandum' on Church difficulties. I need not say that, if you should think it desirable, I will most gladly take part in the meeting between your Grace, himself, and me, which he suggests.

"Mr. Gladstone, as you will see, is not insensible to the great Parliamentary difficulty of carrying through any measure such as you suggest; but it may appear to you (as indeed it does to me), that his tone about it is less discouraging than my own. This (if it is so) is probably due to a real difference in the point of view from which he and I look at the existing combination

against authority in the Church. I have always gone so far as this (and no further) with the opponents of (so-called) *Erastianism*: that I, like them, should consider a mere State or Parliamentary Church unendurable, and that I should dispute any exercise of the undoubted *powers* of Parliament to impose doctrine or ritual upon the Church without the concurrence of Ecclesiastical authority, as making a substantial change in the practical relations between Church and State of such grave importance as to make it probable that even I might regard Disestablishment as a less evil. To that extent, I do not conceive that there is any substantial difference between Mr. Gladstone's point of view and my own.

"But, on the other hand, I regard the resistance offered by so many of the clergy to the judicial supremacy of the Crown, and the pretension that the authority of Ecclesiastical Courts, and of Bishops acting upon their decisions, is vitiated by Parliamentary legislation (without the concurrence of the Convocations) as to the constitution and powers of these Courts, as making a change in the settlement of the relations between Church and State which has existed ever since the Reformation, from the side of the Church against the State, not less substantial, and of not less practical importance; and at least as intolerable and inadmissible in an Established Church, from a State point of view, as the other can be from the point of view of a Churchman.

"How far Mr. Gladstone may agree in this, I do not feel certain. The Ecclesiastical 'Liberationists' are continually quoting, as on their side, his pamphlet on the Royal supremacy, and there are certainly some historical and other views in that pamphlet which do not appear to me to have any sufficient foundation. He seems to regard the celebrated preamble to Henry VIII.'s Statute of Appeals (which, in my view of the history, had no other object in view than to justify the rejection of Appeals to Rome, more especially in the matter of that King's Divorce) as embodying the terms of a compact between Church and State, that the judicial power in the Church should be exercised through Ecclesiastics, or at least through Canonists; and he seems also to think that the Appellate jurisdiction of the Crown in Chancery, under the Statute of (I think) the next year, in Ecclesiastical causes, was, always for several reigns, and always ought to have been, practically limited according to that principle. I regard both these assumptions as absolutely unhistorical

and without support from any possible legal interpretation of the Statutes in question, and as at variance with the true legal and constitutional theory of the supremacy of the Crown 'in all causes,' etc., as expressed in those Statutes which represent the the Crown as the *source* of all '*jurisdiction*' within the Realm, and as confirmed by the Canons and Articles. Furthermore, I consider such a theory of the relations of Church and State (under our existing Church Establishment) to be absolutely unworkable and to be fundamentally inconsistent with the whole current of Parliamentary legislation concerning Church matters for the last three centuries; the effect of which is, that *the whole coercive power* of our Church, concerning doctrine, ritual, and discipline, has come to depend upon the construction of Acts of Parliament. Whether this is, abstractedly, a desirable state of things, or not, I do not care to inquire; but it is, at least (in my opinion), an *endurable* state of things; and of one thing I am perfectly sure, viz., that the demand for its reversal means Disestablishment, and nothing else.

"I have troubled you with this long explanation of my view of the matter, because, if anything practical is to be aimed at, it is necessary that those who confer about it should understand each other's ideas as to the principles involved.

"With respect to Liturgical *Uniformity* my own present preferences are in favour of it, but I would waive them, for the sake of peace in the Church, and to prevent the evils which I should apprehend from Disestablishment. I have an especial dislike to the permission of party symbols in the administration of the Holy Communion, which ought to be emphatically the Sacrament of Unity; but even this is a point which I could waive (with whatever sorrow) for the same reasons. I must however confess my inability to understand how the very same men who insist upon these things, and speak scornfully of a law which treats 'a vestment more or less' as a matter of moment, can pretend, with even a moderate degree of good faith, to take their stand on the settlement of 1662, which established the Act of Uniformity, and drove out of the Church, for the sake of the surplice and one or two other such matters, almost as many ministers as now belong to the English Church Union.—Believe me ever, my dear Archbishop, yours most sincerely,

"SELBORNE."

The suggested interview took place, and the Archbishop's private record of it has been already quoted.¹ It was a sharp disappointment to him to find that the necessary Government support would not be given to any plan for facilitating the enactment of Ecclesiastical bye-laws.

Without such support it would have been only mischievous to introduce the Convocation scheme, but a more favourable ear was turned to his second request—the appointment of a Royal Commission to examine into the constitution and working of the Ecclesiastical Courts. To prevent opposition from unexpected quarters the Archbishop wrote upon this subject to others besides members of the Government. Some of the correspondence is worth preserving.

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Mr. Gladstone.

“ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
18 Jan. 1881.

“MY DEAR MR. GLADSTONE,—The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury will meet for business early in February. May I ask you kindly to let me know soon whether you will facilitate the plan, suggested at our late interview, of a Royal Commission to inquire into the constitution and working of the Ecclesiastical Courts? I am very unwilling to trespass upon you at this anxious time; but I ought to be consulting my brethren the Bishops now on many matters. I am in communication with a great number of the clergy of all shades of opinion as to present difficulties, and though, of course, I would make no announcement without your authority, it would greatly help me in my difficulties if I knew you were likely to look favourably on this healing measure.—Ever yours truly,

“A. C. CANTUAR.”

¹ See p. 431.

Mr. Gladstone to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

" 10 DOWNING STREET, *Jan. 22, 1881.*

"MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—A few words prefatory to my reply will explain my understanding of the question you have put to me.

"Your Grace proposes, I apprehend, to move the House of Lords to address the Crown with a prayer that a Commission may be appointed to inquire into the constitution and working of the Ecclesiastical Courts. And you convey your opinion, with all the weight that belongs to your station and character, that the adoption of such a motion will be in the nature of a healing measure, and will give assistance to your Grace in the discharge of your arduous duties. Such being the case, and taking into view some want of *suite* and method in the legislation on this important subject during the last half century, Her Majesty's Government will render any assistance in their power to the motion which your Grace proposes to make.—I have the honour to be, with much respect, sincerely yours,

"W. E. GLADSTONE.

"P.S.—I have assumed, and I do not doubt, that in making this motion your Grace would represent the general sense of the Bishops."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Mr. Gladstone.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
Jan. 24, 1881.

"MY DEAR MR. GLADSTONE,—It is a great satisfaction to me that you see your way to accede to my request about a Royal Commission on the Ecclesiastical Courts. I shall not fail now to take the opinion of my brethren on the Bench more extensively than I have done hitherto. Those to whom I have confidentially mentioned the subject quite agree with me as to the wisdom of the step, but I shall now take the opinions of all and hope to be able to move for the Commission in the House of Lords with their full concurrence. I do not desire to exaggerate the uneasy feeling which exists, but I am sure the whole matter of the Ecclesiastical Courts wants looking into, and I am still more sure that a comprehensive examination of the whole subject will do good and tend to allay many existing alarms.—Sincerely yours,

A. C. CANTUAR."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Earl of Beaconsfield.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
1st Feb. 1881.

"MY DEAR LORD,—When the Public Worship Regulation Act was passed in 1874, a promise was made that, as soon as conveniently might be, branches of clergy discipline not touched by that Act should be made the subject of legislation. I may confess that the Act of 1874 has not worked very smoothly, and there never has been any time as yet when this promise could be realised.

"I certainly do not think that the time for applying to Parliament to fulfil the promise has come. Any Ecclesiastical Legislation at present seems to be out of the question. . . . And it has occurred to me that good would be done if the whole subject of the Ecclesiastical Courts was calmly considered by a Royal Commission.

"It is now nearly fifty years since such a Commission, on which Archbishops Howley and Harcourt, with Bishops Kaye and, I think, Monk, sat in conjunction with eminent lawyers. All legislation on the subject since has been of a piecemeal character, including the Acts of 1840, 1874, and the final settlement of the Judicial Committee in 1876. Should you think it wise in the Bishops to press this on the Government?

"Certainly there is a great deal of uneasiness both amongst the clergy and amongst many of the Church laity.

"I know you will not object to give me your candid opinion. We need some help which will have a tranquillising effect, and which may promise a solution of difficulties in the future, even if a complete solution cannot be obtained at present.—Believe me to be, my dear Lord, yours very truly, A. C. CANTUAR."

The Earl of Beaconsfield to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"19 CURZON STREET, W.,
Feb. 5, 1881.

"MY DEAR LORD,—Your Grace has given to me a hard question to answer, and I have had many other difficult things to consider during this anxious week. As you wisely observe, ecclesiastical legislation, at this moment, is out of the question. I am,

however, inclined to believe that a Royal Commission, of which the purpose could not be misunderstood, might mitigate and, perhaps, ultimately remove the difficulties that beset our Church, but it must be a Royal Commission proposed by your Grace. Such a proposition by the present Administration would lead to great agitation, and be interpreted as the first step to Disestablishment.—Ever, my dear Lord Archbishop, your Grace's faithful servant,
BEACONSFIELD."

To Lord Salisbury the Archbishop wrote a similar letter to that which he addressed to Lord Beaconsfield. The following was the reply :—

The Marquis of Salisbury to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

"NICE, Feb. 5, 1881.

"MY DEAR LORD,—I think that a Commission would have the effect of giving the Church a respite. It would give the less excited portion of the controversial armies on both sides an excuse for enforcing a truce on their more fiery brethren. And perhaps, when the Commission has reported, the general temperature may be lower, and the danger, in its more acute form, will have gone by. So far the Commission will be of manifest value. But the Commission will only mean delay, and will only confer the benefits which result from delay. It will not cure the evil, and the same causes which have brought on the present crisis will still exist to bring it on again. It is not likely that the Commission will suggest an adequate remedy; they are usually made up of materials too heterogeneous. But, even if it does, it is scarcely possible that Parliament should pass a healing measure. It will probably refuse to touch the question at all; if it passes any measure its usual temper on Church matters is adverse to the party whose grievances cause the present trouble, and both discussion and legislation are likely to have an exasperating influence. It would therefore, I think, not be wise to expect from the labours of a Commission any legislative result which would terminate or allay the strife which now exists. If a Commission is issued,—which, as far as it goes, would be a judicious step,—I cannot but hope that the rulers of the Church

will accompany it by an exertion of their own authority for the restoration of peace. They have the legal power, for both the Acts of 1839 and 1874 give to them full discretion to arrest litigation. If the Bishops could agree to announce the principles on which they would exercise their power ; if they would intimate to their clergy the liberty they were willing to allow, and the point at which their toleration would stop, I believe their decision would be accepted. I do not believe that the spirit of obedience is wanting, or that the mutinous feeling has spread far : what is wanted is a definite word of command. Many clergymen would obey a formal injunction from the Bishops which they scorn when it comes from Lord Penzance, Lord Selborne, or Lord Cairns. On the other hand, the litigious societies would abstain from commencing suits which they knew must be arrested at an early stage. The public, I think, would be glad that the controversy in the Courts of Law should cease, and would not criticise adversely any exercise of the Bishops' legal powers by which that end was attained. I am not, of course, blind to the great difficulty of framing such a decision as I am wishing the Bishops to announce. I believe that the course it ought to take would be to recognise very clearly the distinction between old-established places of worship, and those which, having been built recently, belong rather to the congregation which has been formed in them than to the inhabitants of the district to which (in order to satisfy the law) they have been nominally assigned. In these 'congregational' churches, where the congregation and the incumbent are agreed, I think the Bishops would do wisely to shield the incumbent from litigation, at least if he did not go further than to act upon the apparently literal interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric. If this were accorded and announced, I do not believe that the incumbents of the older Churches would attempt similar practices in opposition to the feelings of their parishioners. The few who did so would be mere eccentrics, and would not be supported. Ritualism is too strong to be 'put down'; a serious attempt to do so would simply shatter the Church. On the other hand, it is odious to the majority of Churchmen, partly from habit, partly from dogmatic objection. The time is passed by when it was possible to conciliate these rival bodies of opinion. If a fatal collision is to be avoided, the only thing to be done is to get them into different buildings. If the Bishops could be induced to take this view, they might do

much to bring about such a distribution of worshippers by a judicious and systematic exercise of their veto on litigation. But whatever view of policy they may take, it is all-important that at this crisis they should lead and not follow. I should counsel a Commission as a subsidiary measure ; but I should regret it if its appointment seemed to the Bishops a good reason for inaction on their part.

“I feel that I have been guilty of much presumption in offering you my opinion at such length, and in matters which you must have exhaustively considered. But I should have never ventured to do so unless you had asked me for my opinion, which I have thought it better to give in full.—Believe me, yours very truly,
SALISBURY.”

Support having been thus promised from both sides of the House, the Archbishop had no difficulty in obtaining the Royal Commission that he desired.

Convocation met on February 8, and the Archbishop again took the unusual step of addressing both Houses together before business began. He referred to the Memorial and Counter-Memorial upon the Ritual question, and promised the fullest and most patient consideration of all that had been laid before him, whether about Rubrics or about Courts.

“A full and enlarged consideration,” he said, “of the whole of this subject by persons whose authority will bear real weight with the Church and with the country is very much to be desired. . . . May I not hope that we, as well as the country in general, are tired of this question? We know that, in the age in which we live, on the faithfulness of the Church of England in the discharge of its highest duties rests the future welfare of this English nation, and not of the English nation only, but I may almost say, of the Christian Church throughout the world. Shall we be engaged longer than is absolutely necessary with the mere outworks of our ecclesiastical system, when we have the Gospel of Christ committed to us, and there is danger lest it be trampled on the ground?”¹

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, Feb. 8, 1881, p. 7.

A formal resolution, requesting the Archbishop to ask for a Royal Commission, was carried unanimously in the Upper House a few days later, on the motion of the Bishop of Peterborough, and on March 7 the Archbishop brought the subject before the House of Lords in a clear and weighty speech. He explained the difficulties which had arisen, and the need of a calm inquiry into their origin :—

“While we have no sympathy,” he said, “with the new theories about the Reformation which have been propounded of late years, we are still anxious that there should be no undue want of tolerance as to matters which are in themselves quite innocent, but which the folly of certain persons regards as a return to things as they were before the Reformation. . . . We know very well, my Lords, that the Church of England has before it at the present moment duties greater, perhaps, than any other society in the world ; we know that from its influence over our Colonial possessions, and from the sympathy which it excites even in countries that are separated from it by another form of religion, it is very powerful beyond the limits of these islands ; but we believe also that this Church must live in the hearts of the people of England. We are sure that if it departed from its principles it would cease to command their willing allegiance. We know that in these days infidelity is rampant on one side, and godlessness on the other, and that the enemies of the Church of England are anxious to avail themselves of every flaw that may be found in its constitution, and to foster every possible quarrel that may arise among good men who have all the same object in view. It is more necessary for us, then, to be on our guard, more necessary for us to have sympathy one for another, to tolerate everything that is entitled to toleration, but not to go beyond the just limits of toleration. My Lords, I do believe it is true, as has often been said, that there is no danger for the Church of England if it does not come from our internal dissensions, and I do hope and trust that if you agree to my request, and Her Majesty be pleased to grant it, this may be the means of dispelling misunderstandings which at present exist, and doing away with jealousies which separate good men, and that thus, by coming to a fuller and clearer understanding of the

greatness of our position, we may enable the Church of England to do well the great work which God has committed to it.”¹

The motion was agreed to, and in the difficult task of selecting the Commissioners the Archbishop was consulted at every step. When the twenty-three names were at length announced, it was seen with what care and impartiality the choice had been made. The Archbishop was elected Chairman, and threw himself with all his energy into what was to be the last great labour of his busy life. Before the Commission met for business (May 28, 1881) its members were invited to a solemn inauguration of their work by a celebration of the Holy Communion in Lambeth Palace Chapel. From the first moment the Archbishop expressed himself with unfailing hopefulness as to what the Commission might accomplish, nor did these hopes ever flag before he died. Of the forty-nine meetings that were held before his last illness began, he attended forty-four. It devolved upon him, as Chairman, to conduct the main examination of every witness, and the sustained vigour, lucidity and dignity with which for fourteen months he discharged this very onerous task evoked enthusiastic praises from his colleagues, including some of the ablest lawyers in the land. During his last illness he repeatedly expressed his thankfulness that he had been allowed to see the work so far upon its way towards the completion he had desired. The Resolution passed by the Commissioners after his death recorded their sense of the “wisdom, experience, and tact with which he constantly guided the course of their deliberations and smoothed the difficulties of their labours.” The resolution went on to say that “his comprehensive consideration as a statesman of the mutual relations of various lines of inquiry and of their united bearing not only upon

¹ *Hansard*, March 7, 1881, p. 387.

religious feeling but upon national life was of the utmost practical value ; whilst the confidence he repeatedly expressed, that the investigations and counsels of the Commissioners would lead to results of high advantage to the people and Church of Christ in England, remains, not only to his colleagues but to many others, as a bright encouragement."

It is necessary, before passing from this subject, to go back a little, in order to recount the share taken by the Archbishop in the controversies and discussions respecting the unhappy imprisonment of the Rev. Sidney Faithorne Green. Mr. Green's parish at Miles Platting was in the Diocese of Manchester and the Province of York, and Archbishop Tait had therefore no *locus standi*, either Diocesan or Provincial, in the matter. But the subject came at length to be one of national concern, in which the Archbishop of Canterbury was perforce involved. Mr. Green's prosecution, under the auspices of the Church Association, began in December 1878, a few months after the close of the Lambeth Conference. The Bishop of Manchester, for reasons which he more than once explained, did not feel justified in imposing a *veto* on the proceedings, and such attempts as he made to allay the strife or to soften its asperities were altogether unsuccessful. The litigation ended in Mr. Green's committal to prison for contempt of court on March 19, 1881.¹ The usual stream of memorials and petitions on either side again flowed into Lambeth, and the subject was earnestly debated both in Convocation and in Parliament. There was no new feature in the case, and the memorialists for

¹ The whole story has been clearly told in *The Lancashire Life of Bishop Fraser* (pp. 397-419). Archbishop Tait never concealed his personal opinion that, notwithstanding Mr. Green's repudiation of Diocesan guidance, the Bishop would have been justified, to say the least, in refusing to allow the suit to proceed when the complainants declined the personal interview to which he invited them (*ib.* p. 403).

the most part did little more than give expression to a genuine feeling of distress at what had happened ; but it was more easy to deplore the evil than to suggest a remedy. In Convocation the Archbishop spoke at length upon the matter. The Bishop of Lincoln had expressed an earnest hope that Mr. Green would even now consent to be guided by his Bishop and "to listen to him as his father in God." The Archbishop warmly echoed this appeal to the imprisoned clergyman.

"I trust," he said, "that Mr. Green may yet come to acknowledge the obligations he took upon himself at his ordination and at his institution to his benefice. . . The matter was distinctly in the Bishop's hands at first, and would have been dealt with by him if Mr. Green had given the slightest intimation that he was ready to submit to the Bishop's authority, but when he entirely repudiated that authority the matter passed into a different phase. . . . If a man is determined to go into gaol it is very difficult to keep him out. There is, I understand, an appeal before the House of Lords in this matter,¹ and no one will be more satisfied than I if that appeal should let Mr. Green out of prison, provided he does not return there the following week. . . . It has been said that these proceedings affect injuriously the position of the Established Church ; but suppose Mr. Green had been a minister of a body which had no connection with the Established Church, and had been prosecuted and dismissed from his office, but refused to accept that dismissal, saying that his conscience would not allow him, I presume he would have found himself exactly where he now finds himself—in the Castle at Lancaster. . . . To-day I have had a case of another kind come under my notice. A clergyman, not in my diocese, has taken it into his head—as if his very salvation depended upon it—that it would be most perilous and sinful if he were to register the burial of a Dissenter under the Burials Act, and that thereby he would become a party to the passing of the Burials Act. He has been

¹ Mr. Green had instituted an action in the Court of Queen's Bench against the authorities who had imprisoned him. From the Queen's Bench he carried the case to the Court of Appeal, and thence to the House of Lords. The decision was given against him in all these Courts, the House of Lords pronouncing final judgment on August 2, 1881.

put in court, and a large amount of fees or expenses has accumulated against him, and he is as likely as not to find himself in prison in the course of the next two or three days. I took it on myself most solemnly to tell the clergyman that there was no obligation on him to disobey the law, and that he could not in any way be supposed to be a party to the passing of the Burials Act; and I trust that the advice I have thus given will enable him to see his way clear to signing the register, and thus prevent his suffering any such penalties as those we are now talking of.”¹

This debate was only one of many, alike unanimous and futile. The problem of effecting Mr. Green's release seemed insoluble either by lawyers or ecclesiastics. In August the aid of Parliament was invoked. Some forty years before, a Quaker named Thorogood had gone to prison rather than pay a trifling church-rate, and a bill had passed through Parliament empowering the Court on its own responsibility to release such prisoners even though their contempt had not technically been ‘purged.’ A similar Bill, to cover cases like Mr. Green's, was now introduced by Lord Beauchamp and warmly supported by Archbishop Tait.

“When a man,” he said, “is convinced in his conscience, however unwisely, that he cannot do certain things, I wish your Lordships to consider whether it does not verge on persecution to insist that he shall come to a Court and declare that to be right which unfortunately in his conscience he thinks wrong. That was exactly the case with Mr. Thorogood in 1840. He owed, I believe, 5s. 6d. for Church Rates, and so strong were his conscientious convictions against the payment of these rates or the acknowledgment of any authority which implied that he ought to pay them, that he was content to languish in prison for sixteen months. The country was scandalised at a respectable man being imprisoned in these circumstances, and Lord John Russell introduced his Bill. . . . The proposal to apply a like principle to the case of Mr. Green commands my cordial support.”²

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, July 20, 1881, pp. 371, 374.

² *Hansard*, August 9, 1881, p. 1359. The bill consisted of a few clauses only. The text of it, in the shape in which it left the House of Lords, will be found in the *Guardian* for 1881, p. 1151.

Thus advocated, the Bill passed through the House of Lords, but here its successful career came to an end. On August 23 a wearied House of Commons disposed of its second reading by a count-out. Baffled in Parliament, the Archbishop turned again to Mr. Green's ecclesiastical superiors. He urged upon the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of Manchester the necessity for a further effort, either to extricate Mr. Green, or to make clear to the public why he still remained in prison. Thereupon followed a correspondence (which has since been made public) between Mr. Green and his Diocesan, and (in November 1881) the Manchester Synod, and the Bishop's formal admonition to his Diocese. These details belong to another biography than that of Archbishop Tait, and, so far as Mr. Green's imprisonment was concerned, they were all in vain. Christmas passed, and, in the opening weeks of 1882, the Archbishop resolved upon a fresh endeavour. He again called upon the Government to consider whether the interference of the Crown was not practicable. To this it was replied that the Home Secretary, "having consulted the law officers of the Crown, is advised by them that the powers of the Crown to discharge persons from custody would not be rightly, or even constitutionally, exercised in the case of a person imprisoned for contempt of Court committed by persistent disobedience to the lawful commands of a competent tribunal."

Next, he sent for the leaders of the Church Association, and in a long interview endeavoured, without effect, to induce them to move for Mr. Green's release. Lastly, he tried to ascertain from Mr. Green himself whether there existed any authority, either ecclesiastical or civil, which he would regard as possessing a claim on his obedience in the interpretation of disputed ritual directions. The correspondence was as follows:—

The Archbishop's Chaplain to the Rev. S. F. Green.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
11th January 1882.

"MY DEAR SIR,—The Archbishop of Canterbury, as you are no doubt aware, has received from many different quarters requests that he will, in such way as he finds possible, take some action for your liberation from prison. Although Miles Platting is situated in the Diocese of Manchester and Province of York, his Grace has, of course on public grounds, been giving attention for a long time past to the circumstances which have in your parish, since 1871, led to the present position of affairs.¹ There is one point upon which the Archbishop would be glad to have some certain knowledge. It is this: What is the existing Ecclesiastical Authority which, if released from prison, you would feel yourself able conscientiously to obey,—not, certainly, as regards your private interpretation of the Rubrics, for that must be a matter of conscience,—but as regards the action you would think it right to take in matters of ritual.

"The Archbishop, in view of possible discussions in Parliament and Convocation upon the subject, would be glad to be furnished with this information, in order that he may, as far as possible, understand your present position.—Yours very truly,

"RANDALL T. DAVIDSON,
"Chaplain."

The Rev. S. F. Green to the Archbishop's Chaplain.

"LANCASTER, Jan. 12, 1882.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter, dated Jany. 11th.

"You will, I hope, pardon me if I remind you that the word 'Ritual' is employed so loosely in the present day, and has reference to things of such very different importance, that to give a satisfactory answer to the inquiry of his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, as you have formulated it, would entail a treatise on Ecclesiastical Polity. I can only reply to your letter in the same general terms, that, in common with Christians generally,

¹ The Bishop of Manchester's first 'monition' to Mr. Green was in January 1871. See *Bishop Fraser's Lancashire Life*, p. 398.

I hope I am ready to obey every duly constituted authority, whether ecclesiastical or civil, acting within its own jurisdiction. I should be happy to answer any question you might think well to address to me on matters of Ritual, but I may perhaps remind you that the actual interpretation of what is called 'Ritual' has only an indirect bearing on my present position, and that, had all the 'charges' made against me been false, instead of only a part, I should be precisely where I am now.

"As the Archbishop has by you expressed a wish to understand my position, I can state it very simply—

"(1) It is demoralising, degrading, and incompatible with the very existence of a Church that any three persons who ignore all their own religious responsibilities should dictate to God's faithful people in matters as to which they have no concern whatever.

"(2) That it is absolutely impossible for an assembly like the House of Commons, upon which the supreme power has now devolved, and which is officially ignorant of the very existence of its God and Saviour Jesus Christ, to be in *any sense whatever* a source of ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

"It has been my misfortune to have both these aspects of the Public Worship Act thrust upon me; they are alike so monstrous that I have never had the least doubt how I ought to act. Should you think it worth while to write again, I should be obliged if you will acquaint me with the significance of the date '1871,' where you speak of 'circumstances which have . . . since 1871, led up to the present position.'—I am, my dear Sir, faithfully yours,
SIDNEY F. GREEN."

The Archbishop's Chaplain to the Rev. S. F. Green.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
18th Jan. 1882.

"MY DEAR SIR,—Absence from home has caused the delay in my reply to your letter of the 12th inst. I am sorry if I failed in my letter of the 11th inst. to make clear what I meant by 'Ritual.' May I re-express the question the Archbishop wishes me to ask of you thus: 'To what existing authority could you, if released from prison, conscientiously render deference or obedience in your practical action as regards the interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric about which so much doubt and diversity has arisen?'

"You will understand, I am sure, that the Archbishop does not suggest that you should be guided by any other authority than private judgment in respect of your personal and private view of the right interpretation of that Rubric. But though, of course, you cannot change your conscientious opinion, it is important for the Archbishop to know whether there at present exists any authority, ecclesiastical or civil, to whose commands you would be disposed to conform your action, under whatever protest you might think necessary for the relief of your conscience.

"You ask, what was the significance of the date 1871 mentioned in my former letter. The Archbishop understood that it was in or about that year that an expression of dissatisfaction on the part of some of your parishioners with the conduct of Divine service in your church came first under the notice of your Diocesan. If this date is incorrect, perhaps you will kindly tell me what was the actual date.—Believe me, my dear Sir, yours faithfully,

RANDALL T. DAVIDSON,
"Chaplain."

The Rev. S. F. Green to the Archbishop's Chaplain.

"LANCASTER, Jan. 19, 1882.

"MY DEAR SIR,—Practically your letter resolves itself into this, does it not? Can I suggest a way of surrendering the Rubrics of the Prayer Book which will not cause me to feel that I have betrayed a trust? I regret to say that I can offer no suggestion whatever.

"I assure you that if I had known of any way of escape I should not have been in prison for ten months, and that is only the least part of what I have been called upon to undergo.

"You will, I hope, pardon my saying plainly that I fail to see how, if I do an action which I believe to be wrong, I mend matters by *proclaiming* that belief and saying, 'I believe so and so to be indefensible; still I do it.' I think people would say, and rightly too, 'The more shame for you.'

"To submit to loss of life, goods, liberty, etc., under protest is plain enough; but to *do wrong one's self* under protest is another matter altogether.

"How sad to think of the thousands of lives wasted on

account of a grain of incense as in the early persecutions, for a mere shibboleth, as in those of a later age, when such a simple means of escape was ready at hand.—I am, my dear Sir, faithfully yours,
SIDNEY F. GREEN.

“P.S.—In regard to the date 1871, I am at a loss to understand what bearing that has upon the present case, seeing that the instruments of this prosecution never at any period attended the Church. They made ‘a complaint’ in 1878, the Bishop of Manchester’s reply to which I enclose. He did not communicate with me on the subject.”

The Archbishop’s Chaplain to the Rev. S. F. Green.

“ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
20th Jan. 1882.

“MY DEAR SIR,—Your letter, just received, makes it clear, if I understand you rightly, that no authority, ecclesiastical or civil, exists to which you would feel yourself at liberty to defer with respect to the practical action which you found upon your own interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric. If I am mistaken in this, please set me right, in order that the Archbishop may clearly understand your position.

“His Grace now directs me to ask you further: Does any authority exist, ecclesiastical or civil, at the command of which you would be willing, under protest if necessary, to abstain for a time from officiating in the church of Miles Platting, if you were now at liberty?

“You will, I am sure, excuse the formulating of the question in this abrupt form, with a view to a clear understanding of the facts of your position.—Believe me to remain, yours very truly,

“RANDALL T. DAVIDSON,
“Chaplain.”

The Rev. S. F. Green to the Archbishop’s Chaplain.

“LANCASTER, Jan. 21, 1882.

“MY DEAR SIR,—In reply to your letter received this morning, I beg to state that you are quite correct in supposing that ‘no existing authority, ecclesiastical or civil’ would ever cause me to assent to the proposition that ‘shall’ is equivalent to

'shall not,' and I say this with no special reference to the Ornaments Rubric, but having in view all laws, injunctions, and directions, human and divine.

"The question which his Grace the Archbishop now puts to me by you in plain words amounts to this: 'You have been in prison ten months for refusing to recognise Lord Penzance's "Inhibition." Will you, in order to obtain your release, discover some valid excuse for recognising it or seeming to recognise it now?'

"I can only say in reply that I should deem it sinful to recognise Lord Penzance in any shape or form as having authority in Christ's Church, and that to introduce 'an authority ecclesiastical or civil,' as an *excuse* for doing so, would, from my point of view, make matters ten times worse, for that would be to *compromise* 'the authority' without in any sense clearing me.—I am, dear Sir, faithfully yours, SIDNEY F. GREEN."

The Archbishop's Chaplain to the Rev. S. F. Green.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
23 Jan'y. 1882.

"MY DEAR SIR,—The Archbishop has no wish to press you unduly to give answers to questions to which you would rather not reply categorically. But he does wish to understand your position, and it seems from your letter of the 21st inst. as though you had somewhat misunderstood the question which his Grace directed me to ask you in my letter of the 20th inst.

"What I meant to put before you, by the Archbishop's desire, was this inquiry. You state that you cannot conscientiously abstain from officiating at Miles Platting at the direction of the Court which has issued an inhibition. Is there any other existing authority, ecclesiastical or civil, whose jurisdiction would on that subject have a better claim on your obedience?

"The Archbishop does not ask you to 'discover a valid excuse for recognising Lord Penzance's inhibition.' But in order better to understand your position he is anxious to learn whether there exists any authority whose competence you do admit.

"I hope I have now made clear what the question is.—Yours truly,

RANDALL T. DAVIDSON,
"Chaplain."

The Rev. S. F. Green to the Archbishop's Chaplain.

"LANCASTER, *Eve Conv. S. Paul*, 1882.

"MY DEAR SIR,—The question in your previous letter was thus worded: 'Does any authority, ecclesiastical or civil, exist, at the command of which you would be willing (under protest if necessary) to abstain for a time from officiating in the Church of Miles Platting, if you were now at liberty?'

"In your letter of this morning you ask: Since I cannot recognise the Court of Lord Penzance, 'is there any other existing authority, ecclesiastical or civil, whose jurisdiction would on that subject have a claim on your obedience?'

"I should naturally have supposed that the first of these dealt with the subject in the concrete, the latter in the abstract; but as you say they are *one* I can only suppose them to mean: 'Will you specify an authority whose inhibition you will recognise?'

"Assuming the above to be correctly stated, I reply, first, that to me the question hardly appears a practical one, because it necessarily involves a due hearing of my case on the part of 'the authority' which is to proceed to sentence. Secondly, that it is somewhat unprecedented to require one who believes himself illegally punished by an incompetent tribunal, to point out some other authority whose *condemnation* he would prefer.

"Even Festus did not say, 'Wilt thou go up to Jerusalem and there be *condemned* for these things?' In Japan, I believe, there does exist an arrangement by which a person distasteful to the Government is invited to be his own jury, judge, and executioner, but I must decline to offer myself as a subject, especially as I know myself 'neither against the law of the Church, neither against the law of the land, to have offended anything at all.'—I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully, SIDNEY F. GREEN."

In addition to this futile correspondence the Archbishop was also in constant communication through his chaplain and otherwise, with the President of the English Church Union, the Hon. C. L. Wood. The following letter, which is one among many, throws light on the Archbishop's position:—

The Archbishop's Chaplain to the Hon. C. L. Wood.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON, 7 *Jany.* 1882.

"MY DEAR MR. WOOD,—Many thanks for writing to me so fully. The Archbishop has read your letter with care, and I have had opportunity of fully talking over the subject with him. You are not mistaken in thinking that the Archbishop is anxious for a solution of the present difficulties, but I confess you surprise me by the suggestion your letter of December 26th contains.

"The Archbishop would not, of course, wish to say beforehand what he may or may not be able to do in the direction you desire, but I should be deceiving you were I to say that I think it probable he could ever take such action as you have suggested upon a vexed question of the Church's law. What I understand you to suggest as possible is that the Archbishop should say in effect: The Courts have declared one thing to be the present law of the Church of England, but their decision seems to me so inexpedient that I propose to decide another thing to be at present lawful and to guarantee the clergy against any harm if they act in accordance with my wishes. Is this putting what you say unfairly? If it is, pray accept my apologies and show me where I am wrong.

"Of course by the valuable provision which gives the Bishop the power of veto at the outset of a prosecution it is meant that he should give special consideration to the particular circumstances of each case that may come before him, and that power of veto has, as you know, been exercised again and again, and probably will continue to be so exercised. But to make what you describe as a general 'declaration on the subject of Ritual,' differing altogether from the law as at present laid down, is surely a different thing altogether and a thing which your friends would I think be the first to repudiate were the Bishops thus to 'take the law into their own hands' in the opposite direction.

"But to come more practically to Mr. Green's own case. Since your letter arrived the Archbishop has had an opportunity of carefully reading the whole correspondence between the Bishop of Manchester and Mr. Green and the parishioners of Miles Platting from the year 1871 down to the present time. He has naturally paid special attention to Mr. Green's statements as to his own position, and was specially struck by one very long and

careful letter written by Mr. Green to the Bishop of Manchester some few months ago. This letter—which I believe you have seen—is of such a character both in its matter and in its tone, that the Archbishop, after deliberately thinking over the whole subject, authorises me to say to you that he considers it impossible for him to interfere in any way on Mr. Green's behalf, unless Mr. Green will, either himself or through some duly authorised representative, state to him explicitly by what existing Ecclesiastical Authority he is ready to be guided—not indeed in his private interpretation of the rubrics, which must be a matter of conscience—but in respect of the course of action which, if released from prison, he is prepared to pursue in matters of Ritual. Surely it is not much to ask for such a statement from Mr. Green as a preliminary to any action which the Archbishop could be asked to take.

“So far as it at present appears, Mr. Green would alike repudiate the direction, however given, of his own Bishop, of the Bishops of his Province, or of the United Episcopate of England.

“If special action is to be taken on behalf of a man accused of disobedience to all authority, it is, I think you will admit, only reasonable that those who are asked to interfere in his favour should be able to state what is the existing authority by which—in practical action—he is prepared to be guided. If he refuses to admit that any such authority exists, the responsibility for consequences, however unhappy, seems to be his own.—Ever yours very truly,

RANDALL T. DAVIDSON.”

When Convocation met in February the subject came up for discussion in both Houses. The debate in the Upper House was of great importance. Bishop Wordsworth, of Lincoln, took occasion to express in emphatic terms his disapproval of the course of action adopted by Mr. Green and his advisers.

“He for one,” he said, “could not sympathise with Mr. Green's practices. He thought Mr. Green was perfectly right in acting according to his conscience, but then it was a man's duty to inform his conscience. . . . He did not think that Mr. Green was acting rightly in his resistance first of all to the canonical authority of his Bishop, which he had pledged himself by a

solemn oath to obey. He did not think he was right in resisting the decrees and judgments of Lord Penzance's Court—he spoke plainly—the Court of Arches, when those judgments were based upon the decisions of the highest Court of Appeal in the Church of England—he meant the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It was said these were ill-constituted Courts. He did not believe there would ever be a perfect Court, either ecclesiastical or civil, in the world. And when he was told it was the Reformation Settlement that Mr. Green and his supporters fell back upon, and that they referred to the sixteenth century for their law and their proceedings and their Court, he (the Bishop of Lincoln) should only say that the present Court of Appeal, though it had many blemishes, was far superior to the Final Court of the Church of England under which the Church lived and prospered, by the blessing of God, for three hundred years.”¹

The Archbishop, in a long and exhaustive speech, explained his view of the whole position, and one portion of his argument sets forth so clearly what had from the first been his contention in the matter, that it is worth while to reproduce it even at the risk of repetition. After recounting the facts of what had taken place, he went on as follows :—

“ It is said that it is too late for Mr. Green to take any steps in this case, that he has been pushed forward by a set of foolish people who wish to make him the leader and the chief of their cause, and who think that the suffering of one clergyman is much more likely to impress the public than any of the arguments which are likely to occur to their minds, so that it is now too late, and that nothing can be done. It is said that he has committed himself, that his supporters have committed themselves, that the prosecutors have committed themselves, and that, therefore, you cannot mend this state of things. But I am not disposed to think that that is exactly the case. . . . There has been a certain amount of ground left open, I think, whereby it would be quite possible for Mr. Green, even at the last moment, to say that he

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, Feb. 15, 1882, p. 40.

bows to the authority of the Bishop. This is my impression, from very recent communications which I have indirectly held with Mr. Green himself. Now, I do not know whether either he or the public in general are aware of the exact force and weight of the authorities that are against him. Your lordships will perhaps remember that, on the 8th of February 1867, a resolution was unanimously adopted by the Upper House of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, which concluded with these words: 'Our judgment is that no alteration from long-sanctioned and usual ritual ought to be made in our churches until the sanction of the Bishop of the diocese has been obtained thereto'; and that the Lower House of the Province of Canterbury, in the same month, passed a similar resolution by 47 votes against 3. Therefore, if a man does not like Lord Penzance, and does not like the Final Court of Appeal, he may perhaps be satisfied when it is called to his mind that that resolution was passed by the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation of this Province, and that a similar decision was arrived at by both of the Houses of Convocation of York. If a man dislikes one authority, and finds another to which he can scarcely, on his own principles, refuse to give some attention, it is possible that when his attention is directed to it he may bow even at the last moment to that authority. And supposing that he doubted whether these resolutions in the year 1867 were resolutions which might not now be reversed, he might be referred to the debate which happened in your lordships' House, and in the Lower House of this Province in 1879, when we were engaged in considering the revision of the Rubrics, in which the same principle was distinctly enunciated, and when we requested the Legislature to add it to the existing Rubric. So that any clearer opinion on the part of simple ecclesiastical authorities, condemnatory of the course which has been adopted, cannot possibly be conceived, and no one, I think, after the steps taken by the Bishop of Manchester, will doubt that a monition of the Bishop of Manchester has been issued forbidding this practice. Then, as your lordships are perfectly aware, another body which those who think that we are in the chains and trammels of the State ought at once to bow to, namely, the assembled Episcopate of the whole Anglican Communion—a hundred bishops gathered together from the whole world in their capacity of Bishops, quite independently of any obligations which they owe to the State here in England—pro-

nounced exactly the same decision, viz. : ' Considering unhappy disputes on questions of ritual, whereby divers congregations in the Church of England and elsewhere have been seriously disquieted, we affirm the principle that no alteration from long-accustomed ritual should be made contrary to the admonition of the Bishop of the diocese.' Well, what is the sort of High Churchman, what is the sort of ecclesiastically-minded man who will put up in opposition to those declarations of the Church in its purely spiritual capacity his own interpretation of a particular Rubric incorporated in the Act of Uniformity? That Act of Parliament, passed after full discussion in Convocation, has been interpreted by the Judges in one sense, and certain of these very ecclesiastically-minded persons say : ' We must interpret this Act of Parliament in another sense, and, therefore, we must resist the decision.' . . . I think really that this is a sort of spurious High Church ecclesiasticism which can scarcely be maintained in the light of day, and, therefore, I am not without some hopes, having always had great faith in the ultimate prevalence of reason and truth, notwithstanding all the tumult which has been raised, and all the reiterated speeches in all parts of the kingdom, principally by the same persons, denouncing the view which I have put forward, that ultimately not only the common sense of the English people, which I am never unhappy about, but also the sense of the persons who advocated this particular view will agree in supporting the cause of order and truth. . . . The great objection to the imprisonment of Mr. Green is (besides the natural feeling one has that he really has had more than enough punishment for whatever he had done), that it is an anachronism, and that the thing is out of date. The world has outlived the idea that offences of that kind are to be punished by incarceration, and though it is perfectly true, and has been argued in the most logical manner, that it is not for any opinions that he has been imprisoned, yet, still, you will never get the people to draw an accurate distinction between the two things ; they know that he held certain unusual opinions, and they know that, as a direct or indirect consequence of holding those opinions, he has been put into this unpleasant position. . . . Therefore, even if there were no other reason than that, I should certainly give my vote for releasing him from imprisonment as speedily as possible." ¹

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, Feb. 15, 1882, pp. 56-7.

Ready as most people were to agree in this opinion, no practical mode seemed to be discoverable for giving effect to it.

During the months of March and April the Archbishop was abroad in very poor health. But the subject was constantly in his thoughts, and he was in almost daily correspondence both with the Government and with the home Episcopate. From the Riviera he wrote to all the Bishops, enclosing a draft scheme he had prepared for the introduction of a Bill to meet the immediate difficulties of the position. His plan was in the direction of giving increased legal authority to the formal monition of a Diocesan in the case of a parish disturbed by ritual disputes. Such monition was to be "issued personally by the Bishop, under his hand and seal, after full consideration of the whole circumstances of the parish, and of any special customs which may have been in use therein." Immediately on his return from abroad an important meeting of the Bishops was held to consider this draft scheme. The Archbishop was disappointed in the hope he had entertained of persuading his brethren to adopt the plan in its entirety, but they consented to his introducing a short Bill in the House of Lords with the single object of effecting Mr. Green's release. Its one operative clause gave power to the Archbishop of the Province to obtain the release of any one imprisoned for contumacy in ecclesiastical causes, if the Archbishop should be of opinion "that scandal exists in consequence of the said imprisonment."¹ On May 16 he introduced this Bill, which had already received the immediate and unanimous assent of Convocation.

¹ The Act was to remain in force for three years only, as it was deemed certain that legislation would by that time have followed upon the Report of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission of 1881-2.

"Imprisonment," he said, "for contumacy in matters ecclesiastical was never contemplated when Parliament passed the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874. The penalty there provided was deprivation after three years, and I will undertake to say that not one of your lordships had any idea that the passing of that Act would ever result in the incarceration of a clergyman."¹

The Bill passed without difficulty through the House of Lords, but in the Commons the same fate befel it which had proved fatal to its predecessor a year before, the House being ignominiously counted out.²

The Archbishop's last illness had already begun, but, except during its acuter stages, he continued to take a keen interest in this and other public questions, and the following extracts from the correspondence which he conducted from his bed, will sufficiently show the part he took in the final stages of the controversy:—

Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P., to the Archbishop's Chaplain.

"FALCONHURST, EDEN BRIDGE, KENT,
Sept. 18, 1882.

"MY DEAR DAVIDSON,—Having had the honour of being intrusted by the Archbishop of Canterbury with the charge in the House of Commons of the 'Imprisonment for Contumacy' Bill, I am naturally anxious to know whether one main purpose of that Bill is likely to be attained.

"Whatever may be the merits of Mr. Green's case, into which I am unwilling to enter, it is certain that the continued imprisonment of a clergyman of the Church of England, not charged with any criminal offence, is a scandal and an anachronism, and must be a source of weakness to the Church herself.

"I feel sure that both the Archbishops concur in this view, as indeed is shown by their having been at the pains to introduce

¹ *Hansard*, May 16, 1882, p. 808.

² On August 16, 1882.

into Parliament the Bill I have referred to. As you know, I was unable to find an opportunity for its discussion till the very end of the Session, when its progress was cut short by a count-out. I do not complain on my own account, but I think the unhappy clergyman who has been eighteen months in prison has reason to complain if his case is not even heard by Parliament, and it seems to me that this is a case which calls for the immediate attention of those who are in authority.

"I could not, of course, trouble the Archbishop with a letter in his present condition, but I trust you may be able to inform me upon a matter so important.—Believe me, yours very truly,

"JOHN G. TALBOT."

The Archbishop's Chaplain to Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
September 19, 1882.

"MY DEAR TALBOT,—In reply to your inquiry about Mr. Green's continued imprisonment, I will tell you exactly how the matter stands so far as the Archbishop of Canterbury is concerned.

"Your efforts having failed to secure the passage through the House of Commons of the Bill introduced into Parliament by the Archbishops, with a view to Mr Green's release, his Grace waited until 16th August, on which day the three years from the issue of the inhibition came to an end. On August 16th the Archbishop wrote to Mr. Gladstone, representing to him and to the Government that the three years had that day expired, and that Mr. Green appeared to be no longer legally the incumbent of Miles Platting. His Grace, therefore, urged upon the Government the duty of at once putting an end to the imprisonment, of which, as you are aware, he had himself always disapproved. Mr. Gladstone replied without delay, promising careful consideration of the matter, and we have heard no more. A few days later the Archbishop's illness assumed its present serious character, and he has, of course, been unable to give consideration to this or to any other public question.

"What further steps, if any, can now be taken I do not know; but the matter appears to rest with the Government.—I remain, ever yours very truly,

RANDALL T. DAVIDSON."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Archbishop of York.

“ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
23 Oct. 1882.

“MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,—I do not know whether it is your intention to take any action in the House of Lords with respect to Mr. Green’s continued imprisonment. I am anxious to avoid in any way compromising you by anything I may do. I have therefore written to Lord Salisbury the letter of which I enclose a copy herewith. This will I hope strengthen your hands should you propose to take action in the same direction, and will in any case leave you entirely unfettered as regards any independent step which you may possibly contemplate.

“The continued imprisonment under present circumstances is matter of national concern.

“I am told by the doctors that I am on the road to convalescence, but I am not yet able to leave my bed. I have to thank you for more than one kind letter addressed to Davidson.
—Ever yours,

A. C. CANTUAR.”

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Marquis of Salisbury.

“ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
23rd Oct. 1882.

“MY DEAR LORD,—I am, of course, quite unable to be present in the House of Lords at its meeting to-morrow. I have not yet been allowed to leave my bed, though the doctors believe me to be on the road to recovery.

“It seems to me of great importance that notice should be called in the House of Lords to the continued imprisonment of Mr. Green. You will remember that when the Contumacy Bill was introduced a few months ago by the Archbishop of York and myself, the Lord Chancellor emphatically stated in debate that Mr. Green’s imprisonment would terminate when three years had expired from the date of the monition or inhibition. The three years expired—at the latest—on the 16th August last, on which day I wrote to the Prime Minister to call his attention to the fact. But Mr. Green still remains in prison, with no apparent prospect of release. Were I able to be in my place in the House I should at once give notice of a question upon this

subject. I do not know whether you would be disposed, in my absence, to ask such a question, in your own words of course, but avowedly *at my request*. If you are willing to do so I should be very grateful.

"I do not know whether the Archbishop of York, to whose Province Mr. Green belongs, proposes to take any action in the House of Lords, but I naturally desire to leave him quite uncompromised by anything I may do or say on my personal responsibility as Archbishop of Canterbury. I therefore venture to lay the matter before your Lordship, and I have told the Archbishop of York that I have done so.—I remain, my dear Lord, yours very truly,
A. C. CANTUAR."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of Manchester.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
10th October 1882.

"MY DEAR BISHOP,—I am not yet well enough to write to you in my own hand, but I am anxious to make a suggestion to you in case it may not have occurred to yourself.

"It seems now that the Government has decided upon its own inability to release Mr. Green from prison, and unless somebody intervenes it is not evident that even a new appointment to the living would liberate him.

"I presume the Provincial Court has the power to order his release if properly put in motion. Might not you, as Bishop of the Diocese, now claim to be heard in Lord Penzance's Court to the effect that you believe the benefice to be vacant, and that you therefore protest against Mr. Green's further imprisonment, and request his release as a matter of simple justice.

"You certainly ought to have a *locus standi* before the Court in such a matter. You may very likely have already considered the possibility and expediency of such intervention; but in case you have not done so I venture to put it before you, and I feel sure you will excuse me for doing so.—I am, ever yours very truly,
A. C. CANTUAR."

The Bishop of Manchester did not at first see his way to accede to this suggestion:—

"The case," he wrote, "bristles with difficulties on every side.

The man I have to deal with . . . is backed by an extreme party with ulterior aims, aims which have been fully avowed, and which mean nothing less than the destruction of all (now) recognised law and authority. The difficulties press upon me so heavily that I am seriously tempted to resign my bishopric, and let some one else deal with the case who is not compromised by what has been done in its earlier stages."

On further pressure, however, from the Lord Chancellor and others, the Bishop of Manchester yielded to the Archbishop's request. On the 4th of November he made formal application by Counsel for Mr. Green's release from custody. The application was successful, and Mr. Green was the same evening set at liberty.

An attempt has now been made to give some consecutive account of the Archbishop's relation to what is called the 'Ritual Controversy' during the last seven years of his life. It became at times an absorbing topic, mainly on account of the indirect results which it involved, nor has it been possible to record very briefly a matter of such widespread interest. But it is necessary to remember that the space occupied by the narrative is out of all proportion to the Archbishop's estimate of its direct importance. His speeches and letters must have made it clear how anxious he always was to relegate the subject of ritual details to the comparatively insignificant place which he thought to belong to it, in face of the great problems of faith and morals which were claiming the attention of the Christian Church. The question was forced into prominence by the far larger subject which had become connected with it—nothing less than the whole question of authority and discipline within the Church. The mistake has been often made of attributing to him a fixed resolve to "stamp out ritualism." To those who knew him best such a description of his policy is almost

ludicrous. He had certainly no sort of appreciation or sympathy for what is popularly known by that name, or for the semi-Roman doctrines which its opponents believe it to be designed to teach. It has already been pointed out how he underrated the almost vital importance attached by thousands of devoted English Churchmen to an æsthetic and symbolic Ritual. It was not, however, the discouragement, still less the suppression, of such Ritual that he mainly desired. What he did care for in these later controversies was, first, the promotion, if possible, of peace within the Church, that she might better face the great questions which were stirring around her, and secondly, the recognition of the supreme authority of law and order whether in sacred things or secular. If the latter of these principles was the more obvious throughout his active public years, it was the former which inspired him in the characteristic episode of his last days on earth, the well-known correspondence with Mr. Mackonochie of St. Alban's. That correspondence came about as follows. The long series of lawsuits in which Mr. Mackonochie was defendant had in the autumn of 1882 reached a point at which his formal deprivation, by order of the Court, seemed at last to have become inevitable. In the month of October, during one of the easier intervals of his long illness, the Archbishop received an intimation that this sentence was shortly to be pronounced. Negotiations had for some time been in progress for promoting an exchange between Mr. Mackonochie and another incumbent of like opinions, and thus removing the defendant from the jurisdiction of the Courts he had so long refused to recognise. Of these negotiations the Archbishop had been kept informed, but he had no official *locus standi* in the matter, which belonged entirely to the Diocese of London. The Bishop of London was puzzled

how to act, and, as he afterwards explained, he shrank from burdening the Archbishop on his sick-bed with a request for counsel. As a matter of fact the Archbishop would unhesitatingly have advised the Bishop to consent to the proposed exchange, but he refrained from volunteering advice. "I dare not," he said, "press the Bishop to take a step for which he is sure to be abused, when I shall perhaps not be here to see him through." But so anxious did he feel in the matter that he took the unusual course of writing privately to the legal authorities to ask for delay :—

"I understand privately," he said, "that it is not impossible that steps may now be taken to withdraw the case of Mr. Mackonochie from the Courts. If this be so, it would be very greatly to the advantage of peace in the Church. . . . It is obviously desirable that, if possible, a little time should be given, rather than that the matter should be pressed forward."

The delay was granted, but a fortnight later the Archbishop was informed on good authority that the negotiations for exchange of livings had completely broken down. He thereupon resolved to write direct to Mr. Mackonochie, and the following correspondence ensued :—

*The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Rev. A. H.
Mackonochie.*

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
Nov. 10, 1882.

"MY DEAR MR. MACKONCHIE,—My thoughts—so far as I am able at present to give steady thought to public matters—have naturally dwelt much upon the troubles and difficulties which have made themselves apparent in connection with recent ritual prosecutions. I am exceedingly anxious that the result of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts should, by the blessing of Almighty God, be such as to allay disquiet, and, by meeting any reasonable objections to existing procedure, to set men's minds free for the pressing duties which devolve upon the Church

in the face of prevailing sin and unbelief. Anything which at this moment increases bitterness of feeling may do permanent mischief to the cause which we all have at heart. Anything which tends to preserve peace now will make a satisfactory solution of our difficulties far easier. I venture, therefore, privately to write to you, though I cannot yet do so with my own hand, to invite you seriously to consider whether you can in any way contribute to minimise the present feeling of bitterness which undoubtedly exists in some quarters. I need not assure you that I do not wish in any way to dictate to you a course of action ; but if you feel it possible, consistently with duty, to withdraw voluntarily, by resignation of your benefice, from further conflict with the Courts, I am quite sure you would be acting in the manner best calculated to promote the real power and usefulness of the Church to which we belong. I make this appeal to you under a strong sense of responsibility. You will, I think, feel with me that the circumstances under which I write are altogether exceptional, and you will, I know, give prayerful thought to the subject. I commend you to the guidance of Almighty God, and ask that He may give to us in these difficult times a right judgment in all things.—I remain, yours very truly,

“A. C. CANTUAR.”

*The Rev. A. H. Mackonochie to the Archbishop of
Canterbury.*

“S. ALBAN’S CLERGY HOUSE, Nov. 11, 1882.

“MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—Your kind letter of yesterday reached me last night. Your Grace will understand that in a matter of so deep importance I shall not answer definitely without that time for earnest seeking after the guidance of Almighty God to which you refer me, although indeed your Grace will not doubt that I have endeavoured to gain it and to act upon it throughout the troubled circumstances of the last sixteen years. It is a great regret to me that any of my concerns should be adding to the pressure of your Grace’s anxieties under the severe illness which Our Lord has sent to you. Therefore my final answer shall reach your Grace with as little delay as possible. With earnest prayer for your Grace’s restoration to health,—believe me, my dear Lord Archbishop, yours truly and very respectfully,

ALEX. HERIOT MACKONOCHIE.”

The Archbishop's Chaplain to the Rev. A. H. Mackonochie.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
Nov. 21, 1882.

"MY DEAR SIR,—You have probably seen in the newspapers the account of the less favourable condition of the Archbishop's health. As a matter of fact, it is now evident that the doctors have almost, if not quite, abandoned any real hope of an ultimate recovery, though there may possibly be a temporary rally. I think it only right to tell you that among the very few matters concerning the outside world which at present find a recurring place in his thoughts, and in his conversations with me, is the private correspondence on which he has entered with you. I tell you this merely in case you should suppose, from the doctor's bulletin, that the Archbishop is at present too ill to receive any letters. It is not quite so, and he asks me every day if there is any letter for him from you. I am sure you will not misinterpret this letter, which, with some misgivings, I write unknown to the Archbishop. It is merely intended, with the utmost respect, to relieve you of any doubt you may be feeling as to whether you would be justified in writing at present to the Archbishop, should you find it possible to do so.—Believe me to remain, yours very truly,

RANDALL T. DAVIDSON."

The Rev. A. H. Mackonochie to the Archbishop's Chaplain.

"S. ALBAN'S CLERGY HOUSE,
Nov. 22, 1882.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I am very sorry to hear your account, corroborating the very serious ones in the recent bulletins. I will send the Archbishop a definite answer, if possible, by to-morrow night's post. It has been much on my mind not to have answered sooner, for the very reason which you suppose to have caused delay. I have been anxious daily to come to a conclusion, feeling that every day's delay must be an additional anxiety to his Grace. . . .—Believe me to remain, dear Sir, yours very truly,

"ALEX. HERIOT MACKONOCHIE."

*The Rev. A. H. Mackonochie to the Archbishop of
Canterbury.*

“S. ALBAN’S CLERGY HOUSE, *Nov.* 23, 1882.

“MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—I am sorry to have been obliged to add to your Grace’s anxiety by a less speedy reply to your letter than I could have desired. The subject of your letter has, I think, rarely been out of my mind since I received it, except when at times driven out by press of active work. The conclusion at which I have arrived is to acquiesce in your Grace’s wish that I should resign my benefice. You will understand that it is to myself, and will be to my people, a great sorrow, but one which I hope we shall be willing to bear, if the true peace and liberty of the Church can be obtained by my compliance. My life, hitherto, since my ordination, has had for its supreme object the seeking those gifts for the Church, and I am contented, if so it be, to give up my peace for hers. Your Grace will, I am sure, understand that I cannot in this matter act otherwise than with that obedience to my conscience to which you refer me, so that you will not think that I have changed my conviction as to the State Courts. I accept the line of action which your Grace has indicated, simply in deference to you as supreme representative of Our Lord Christ in all things spiritual in this land, and not as withdrawing anything which I have said or done in regard to those Courts. This I cannot agree to in any way whatever. No one can deny that the bitterness which your Grace would abate is altogether an exceptional circumstance, giving rise to exceptional remedies to avert, if it may be, by the goodness of God, ruin from His Church, and leaving her free for the future discharge of her great mission at home and in foreign lands. For myself I hope I may depend upon your Grace’s good offices with the Bishop of London, so that I may be licensed or instituted at once to whatever work in the Diocese may offer itself to me. Thanking your Grace for your commendation of me to the guidance of Almighty God, and with my own unworthy prayers for your Grace in all your sickness,—believe me, my dear Lord Archbishop, yours truly and very respectfully,

“ALEX. HERIOT MACKONOCHE.”

The Archbishop's Chaplain to the Rev. A. H. Mackonochie.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
Nov. 25, 1882.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I am directed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to express to you with how strong a feeling of thankfulness to God he has received your letter of the 23d inst. The Archbishop desires me also to enclose to you a copy of a letter he has to-day sent to the Bishop of London, and to say that he has no objection to your giving publicity to the correspondence if you think it desirable to do so. It will, I feel sure, be a satisfaction to you to know what pleasure your letter has brought to the Archbishop in these his last days, as it would seem, upon earth.—Yours very truly,

"RANDALL T. DAVIDSON."

The Archbishop of Canterbury to the Bishop of London.

"ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
Nov. 25, 1882.

"MY DEAR BISHOP OF LONDON,—I enclose to you a copy of a correspondence that has passed between Mr. Mackonochie and myself. I have, of course, in no way committed you by the action I have thought it well to take in the interests of peace. It appears to me a great blessing that a gate of reconciliation should have been opened by Mr. Mackonochie's willingness to resign. He has, of course, in coming to this decision, had serious difficulties to contend with from the advice of his friends; and it seems to me that he has in this case shown his consideration for the highest interests of the Church by sacrificing his individual feelings in deference to my appeal.—I remain, my dear Bishop, for ever yours truly,

A. C. CANTUAR."

The Rev. A. H. Mackonochie to the Archbishop's Chaplain.

"S. ALBAN'S CLERGY HOUSE,
Dec. 1, 1882.

"MY DEAR MR. DAVIDSON,—Probably the letter enclosed will find the Archbishop unable to hear it read, if indeed he have

not entered the true life. If, however, he is still with us, and able to hear it, I shall be very glad, as it may please him. Thank you for your last letter, and believe me, yours very truly,

“ALEX. HERIOT MACKONCHIE.”

*The Rev. A. H. Mackonochie to the Archbishop of
Canterbury.*

“S. ALBAN’S CLERGY HOUSE,
Dec. 1, 1882.

“MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—Your Grace will, I think, like to know that I have to-day formally resigned this benefice. Also, I think your Grace may be pleased to know that I shall probably be nominated to the benefice of S. Peter’s, London Docks, from which Mr. Suckling will be transferred to S. Alban’s. Allow me to express at this time my deep gratitude for your Grace’s kindness and generous feeling towards me ever since the time that I entered the diocese of London in 1858, and that often in critical circumstances.—Believe me, yours truly and very respectfully,
ALEX. HERIOT MACKONCHIE.”

Of this final letter the Archbishop never knew. It arrived at noon upon the day before he died. But the previous letters had set his mind at rest, in the happy knowledge that to the combatants of fifteen years he had been enabled to bequeath a legacy of peace.

CHAPTER XXXI.

GENERAL SPEECHES AND LETTERS.

INFLUENCE OF HIS SPEECHES—ST. MARTIN'S LEAGUE—C.E.T.S.—
"CRISES IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND"—MANSION-HOUSE
SPEECHES—CHURCH DEFENCE—TRIBUTES TO WILBERFORCE
AND SELWYN—ROYAL ACADEMY—ROYAL COLLEGE OF MUSIC
—RELATION TO NONCONFORMISTS.

1876-1881.

QUOTATIONS have been made, in the foregoing chapters, from the Archbishop's speeches and letters upon most of the great controversies in which he was engaged. But these formed, of course, only a small proportion of his weekly, sometimes daily, public utterances. He was exercising a far more important, because a wider, influence by means on the one hand of what must be called his 'casual' speeches, both in Parliament and on public platforms, and on the other by means of the careful and weighty arguments of his recurring Diocesan Charges. The latter had a wide circulation, even among readers who generally, and not perhaps unwisely, eschew that form of literature; and the value in particular of his last two charges, the volumes of 1876 and 1880, was attested by the multitude of letters he received upon their publication, from every part of the English world. In these two Charges he entered with some care and copiousness upon the consideration of the speculative and doctrinal difficulties which in this century beset the Church of Christ. Its 'conflict with the Atheist'—'with the Deist'—'with

the Rationalist'; 'its Dogmatic teaching'; 'its Catholicity'; and the practical nature of its work. These Charges, as an exceptionally competent critic has observed—

"Are full of practical wisdom and deep Christian experience. He succeeded eminently in selecting, with the eye of a great master, the main points of attack and defence; he laid down in broad and solid outline the great principles involved in the Christian faith and the cardinal realities on which they rest."¹

Vigorous and readable as these Charges undoubtedly are, it would be impossible, in a biography, to make suitable selections, and the separate volumes, if they are to be rightly estimated, should be, in each case, examined as a whole. The effect they produced at the time upon thoughtful minds is well illustrated by such a letter as the following, which has come quite accidentally to hand. It was written in 1876 by one who is now in the front rank of the Church's leaders :—

"What a true great man is dear old Tait. I have been reading the two first instalments of his charge in the *Times*, and I rejoiced greatly as I read. His words are like a battle-cry, so stirring and generous, and withal true and real and wise. Amidst the ignorance, superstition, and pettiness of so many so-called leaders, what a joy it is to get such a challenge as his, and to follow him in the path of the Church's true and inevitable future—so far at least as one has strength and faithfulness."

With respect to the Archbishop's accidental and ordinary speeches in the routine of his public work, the difficulty of quotation is of another kind. Their effectiveness depended for the most part upon their actual delivery. It was due far less to any marked originality or stirring eloquence than to their plain, straightforward honesty and common sense, prosaic characteristics which were

¹ *Quarterly Review*, vol. clv. p. 9.

brightened and made even attractive by the under-current of quiet and kindly humour which somehow or other pervaded all he said, and established as it were a friendly and personal relation between his hearers and himself. To reproduce this particular effect is impossible, and so subordinate was the shrewd dry humour to the larger purposes of each appeal that it in no way detracted from what has been described as "a certain massiveness in all his utterances, which rendered them far more effective in any thoughtful assembly than the utmost brilliancy of argument or rhetoric." There is little in his ordinary speeches that will bear the test of isolation from its context without appearing almost commonplace; and yet their cumulative weight throughout a year, and their steady and reassuring effect upon the Church and Nation, were undoubtedly immense.

It has been pointed out in an earlier chapter how the key-note of his public life was his insistence on the National character of the Church's responsibility and work; and there is scarcely a speech of his on any public question, throughout his long Episcopate, in which reference is not made, however briefly, to this aspect of the familiar facts, either as justifying a call upon every citizen, irrespective of sectarian divisions, to rally to the defence and improvement of what belongs to all, or, on the other hand, as a reminder of the sacredness in all its parts, of what is too often looked down upon as mere 'secular' work. Addressing, for example, the guild or society of London postmen, known as "St. Martin's League," he used such words as these: ¹—

"There are many false ideas abroad in the present day as to the possibility of disjoining a man's religious life from his ordinary secular life: these, I believe, are all based upon the grossest

¹ On Feb. 26, 1882.

error. In Scotland there is a proverb which speaks of a man who is 'a street saint and a house devil.' There are many who think that they may leave their religion when they cease to be seen by others, and in the privacy of home cast off the religious principles which they profess to their own advantage and the edification of others in the streets. But there is another side also to the matter : a man may keep his religion for his home and not bring it with him into the streets ; he may be a saint at home, and the very reverse of a saint, say, on the Stock Exchange ; he may be a saint in his own house and in the estimation of many who are near to him, and yet in his public capacity he may think that religion has nothing to do with his life as a citizen ; his Parliamentary life, for example, may be anything but a religious life, and yet he may be in some aspects of his life a religious man. But all this is grounded on a deep mistake. The essence of the Church of Christ is not the profession at stated times of certain expressions of orthodox opinion ; it is not the initiation into certain ceremonial rites ; it is a heart devoted to God through the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the heart are the issues of life. He who has the faith of Christ in his heart must show this faith in all his dealings with his fellow-men ; there is no separation between his political life and his private life, for his religion, if it is worth anything, regulates the whole dealings of the man, and shows itself and supplies the principles on which he acts in every position in which God can place him. One word let me say to you as to the name of your society, the 'League of St. Martin.' I do not know whether there is any thought of the old legend of St. Martin and his cloak, and that you, like him, are ready to give one half of the good things with which God has supplied you, if by any means you may help others who are less privileged than yourselves. But you take your name really from St. Martin's-le-Grand. It was so called because from the Conquest to the time of Henry VIII. there was a great monastery and a sanctuary, which spoke of Christian kindness and mercy in those dark ages when violence stalked unrestrained abroad. All the old ecclesiastical buildings that stood in St. Martin's-le-Grand are long since gone. There is the centre of the busiest part of our life, communicating with every portion of the habitable globe. But is there anything to prevent that great mart of the world's industry from being as truly a centre of religion as were the old ecclesiastical buildings which they superseded ? If

Christ is honoured He will be honoured in the mart of commerce and in the hurry and din of the Post Office as much as in any church. God grant that you, associating yourselves together in the name of Christ and helping one another for Christ's sake, may be the means of strengthening every Christian influence in the midst of the hurry and business of this greatest commercial city of the world."

Again, when presiding, on February 18, 1873, over the great meeting at which the Church of England Temperance Society was established on its present basis, he gave a straightforward and practical answer to the objection raised against the founding of another "denominational" society:—

"You may ask," he said, "why in the world should this new organisation be a '*Church of England* Temperance Society'? Temperance, I presume, is preached by all denominations, and we are glad to meet and work with persons of all beliefs—Roman Catholics, Protestant Dissenters, Jews, whoever they be—if they will join in inculcating upon men the great duty of temperance and sobriety. We wish them God-speed in their work. At the same time we have, as it happens, an organisation—thank God we have an organisation—which reaches to every parish in England. We have the means of reaching, in the shortest possible time, every man who is living in any quarter of the realm. We have also—thank God we have, and I trust we shall have for centuries to come—an educated man, the accredited minister of the National Church, resident in the midst of every community, with incomparable advantages for gathering the people round him, and organising them for any good purpose which may subserve the kingdom of Christ. Surely, then, it is well, in this most important matter, to avail ourselves of an organisation ready to our hands. It is in no spirit of separating ourselves from others, but because we think that we have in our National Church and its constitution the best possible means of advancing a good work, that we have formed this Church of England Temperance Society, not as an antagonist to, but as a friendly rival in good works to all who, beyond our own communion, are seeking with us to advance the cause of Christ."

Among the Primate's lighter duties is the task of constantly making speeches of a general character at anniversary gatherings, Mansion-House banquets, and the like, on behalf of the Church of England; and few people perhaps consider how severe a tax is thus imposed upon a man advanced in life, harassed all day long with urgent and important duties, and expected, upon each occasion, however often they may recur throughout the year, to say something which shall be neither dull, nor stale, nor frivolous. The Archbishop attached no small importance to these opportunities, and though, from the nature of the case, the speeches were not of permanent value, he again and again managed to say something he might have found it hard to say elsewhere. One or two—almost random—quotations may be given from his speeches in the last years of his life, to show the consistent hopefulness of his attitude at a time when not a few were taking gloomier views. Speaking at Cranbrook, for example, on June 18, 1880:—

“ . . . I am not an alarmist,” he said, “ I never was, and I hope I never shall be. Some of the denunciatory friends we were talking of say that the Bishops go about making rosy speeches, and trying to make the best of a bad business. I do not think I am guilty of that. What I do feel is, that we are to look to the good that is around us, and to be of a good heart; and, fortunately, looking to the good that is around us, we have great cause to be of a good heart. The times, of course, are always anxious. Ever since I was a boy, I have always heard that the Church of England has been passing through a crisis, and I believe it has. It has got out of all these crises, and it will get out of all others. In point of fact, this is nothing more than is true of every good institution throughout the world. They are always passing through crises. They are always exposed to danger. There are always a number of mischievous people who try to injure good institutions; but, by God's blessing, these good institutions sail on, carrying the freight they were designed to

convey. We are not going to despond. There is nothing to despond about. We are all of us ready for our work. We are ready to meet any opposition that may be raised. Who is it that is going to oppose us? Let him stand out, and we are happy to meet him face to face. If he wishes to meet us by argument, we are quite ready to give him better arguments than he can produce. If he meets us by abuse, we leave him alone to continue that style of discussion. This being the case, and the Church of England being on the whole one of the very best institutions on the face of the earth, and being on the whole, if you look to essentials, in a very hopeful condition, being violently opposed, no doubt, as are all good institutions, and quite ready to meet the opposition, I think we have reason to thank God for the position it occupies in the country at the present moment, and to feel tolerably confident that, under God's blessing, it will maintain that position for the good of the country for many years to come."

Again, at Croydon, a few months later, at one of his great 'visitation luncheons,' he said :—

"This is now my third visitation, and as a visitation comes round only once in four years, I am reminded that I am approaching the end of the twelfth year since my appointment to the Primacy, and that twenty-four years will soon have elapsed since I was called to the office of Bishop. The time has been an anxious one, and a great many changes have taken place. I believe, of those who were Bishops at the time of my appointment, there are now only two remaining. It is, therefore, a somewhat anxious time to look back upon, for him whose stewardship must soon be drawing to a close. Now, surely any honest man who compares the facts of to-day with those of twenty-four years ago, must acknowledge that, all along the line, there has been a steady, though a gradual, improvement, and looking to God's goodness in the past, there is every reason to anticipate a happy future. I do not believe that the storms which from time to time agitate either Church or nation, are such as will produce any very serious demolition of that which is good in the one or the other. We have seen stormy times before now. I can look back and remember when, in the years that followed 1832, we were all told to set our houses in order, for that

probably to-morrow we should die. But we did not die, and things have gone on more prosperously ever since that time than they did before. We hear now that the House of Lords is going to be abolished. I do not think it is. My impression is, that, although I have the deepest respect for the House of Commons, if the events of the last few days were compared, the people of England would say, on the whole, that the House of Lords came better out of the ordeal than the other House. We hear also that the Church is going to be abolished, or rather that its connection with the State is to be at once dissolved. I don't share that opinion. Are we sure that those who are making so great a noise have any real power behind them proportionate to the noise they make? I believe myself that, for many years to come, the Church of England will be, so far as outward arrangements are concerned, pretty much in the same state as it is now. Not, I hope, in quite the same state, for I have been all my life a reformer, and I could name to you not a few things in which I hope and expect still, if God spare my life, to see one or two reforms before I die. I look forward, indeed, to the time which lies ahead, when the whole world shall, by the blessing of Almighty God, have so improved that it will be making ready for the coming of the Lord. As I said just now, I have been all my life more or less a reformer. Reformers are not, as a rule, very popular people, and it is quite possible, indeed I know it is certain, that during the greater part of my life I have been, so far as the clergy are concerned, somewhat in the minority in the opinions I have formed for my own guidance.¹ But somehow, on looking back, I find that opinions which were once scouted have, in course of time, become extremely popular. It was said by a shrewd observer, many years ago, that the first criticism usually made when any change was proposed, was that it was impossible; secondly—after a time—that it was contrary either to the Christian Faith or to the British Constitution; and thirdly—after a little longer time—that no sensible man had ever doubted that it was in every respect wise and good. A man who wishes to pass on the whole satisfactorily through life, had better act according to his lights, making up his mind very carefully as to what is right, and then setting about it: he had better take all the advice given him in good part, but, upon the whole, deter-

¹ This speech was made during the height of the Burials Bill controversy of 1880.

mine that the best thing he can do, in ordinary circumstances, is to act upon his own deliberate convictions. I think very little, however, of that man who considers that in every conceivable case he is bound to act entirely on his own convictions, and to pay no heed to the people who have the misfortune to differ from him. I have now been twenty-four years a Bishop, and during that period I have been brought into contact with persons of all grades of opinion in the Church of God. The lesson I have derived from this contact has been to respect deeply the opinions of those who are not afraid to act according to the dictates of their consciences. I believe all of them, as they become more conscientious, will be tolerant of difference of opinion; and if I may single out any one characteristic of the Church of England which seems to indicate it as the Church of a great and world-extending nation, it is this: that it is wide enough to embrace within its sympathies all the various shades of opinion which the different schools of the Church contain. Had any one school of thought so prevailed as to drive all others out of the Church, it would have been an evil day for the Church and the nation. Looking abroad, I do not see this liberty in any other country or Church but our own; on the contrary, what one sees elsewhere is, that men are driving each other forth because of their differences in religious sentiment. I thank God that I belong to a Church and a nation which understands what is Catholicity in its true sense, and embraces in one fold good men who desire to promote their Master's cause, even though, in many points, they differ very widely from each other."

One more example of this kind, from a speech delivered at the annual 'Bishops' dinner' at the Mansion-House, about a year before he died:—

"Some people suppose," he said, "that the Bishops live in an atmosphere of adulation, and that, surrounded by chaplains and intimate friends, they never hear a word of blame, but dwell in a fool's Paradise, thinking themselves the wisest and best of men. It has, however, been ordained by Providence that this ideal should not be realised. There was a time, even within my memory, when Bishops could not show themselves in public without opprobrious epithets being launched at their heads, and indeed they were fortunate if they always escaped with oppro-

brious epithets. Many here may recollect how an enraged cow was deliberately driven into the thick of a procession of clergy in Bishop Blomfield's days in Bethnal Green, and dead cats were proverbially the appropriate missiles in the Reform Bill agitations of my early years. Well, gentlemen, we see—perhaps I ought to say we feel—less of this sort of thing nowadays. Still we have an ample and varied experience of missiles of one sort or another, and this from the most unexpected quarters. Sometimes, instead of the rude projectiles which our predecessors suffered from, we have projectiles of a not less disagreeable sort from those who express the extremest reverence for our office. The Church newspapers are a ready channel for such onslaughts. And no doubt it is well, for we might otherwise imagine ourselves both better and wiser than we are, and every man who tells us the truth, even though it be somewhat highly coloured, is entitled to our respectful thanks. Our office, gentlemen, is a very difficult one, and some consideration is perhaps due to those who are striving conscientiously, however inadequately, to discharge its manifold responsibilities. No one, I think, will accuse the Bishops of to-day, as men accused their predecessors, of being ‘unpreaching prelates and dumb dogs’: that is not the besetting sin of the present members of the Bench; indeed, I sometimes wonder if it might not be well that there should occasionally be more dumbness than there is. Bishops, besides being Ministers of the Gospel, are intrusted with the chief management of a very great and complicated society, which affects the performance of all sorts of duties throughout the Christian world. It cannot be denied that we have all at times a deep sense of failure in the performance of a work so varied as ours is. We do fail—we know it only too well—but it is not, I assure you, for want of advice. Of that we have abundance every day, and I often marvel at the universal consciousness that every one else except the Bishops is so wise. But, take it all in all, whatever our shortcomings, individual or collective, the march is ever forward and upward, and I honestly believe that by the blessing of Almighty God the Church of to-day will hand on its heritage unimpaired to the generations which are yet unborn.”

The subject of Disestablishment was one on which he was constantly urged to speak, but he usually refused to

do so, on the ground that every such discussion was apt to be misinterpreted as an anticipation of immediate danger, and that it acted therefore as an incentive to the Church's assailants. Occasionally, as at the annual meetings of the Church Defence Institution, he referred in detail to the so-called 'Liberationist' schemes, and called attention to the strangeness of the alliance between the religious and the anti-religious elements of the Radical party. Presiding at the Church Defence Institution on July 6, 1881—

"I do not think," he said, "that the experience of other countries, where these matters have been thrown into the crucible, and the question has been fairly tried, whether the Christian religion is or is not to be maintained in a country, is very encouraging for those who are our opponents. I do not believe that in the country which is nearest to us, and in which questions of this kind have of late cropped up, and divided political parties into an almost internecine hatred of each other, there is any great encouragement given at present to people in England to put themselves in the same position as the enemies of religion are placed in in that country. But still that is no reason why we are not to keep our eyes open. There are, of course, as we are all aware, a great number of people who are banded together for the purpose of injuring the Church of England. There is no doubt about it. There is one very curious thing about this combination—that it consists of people who have really nothing whatsoever in common. I cannot suppose that a conscientious Dissenting minister whose whole life, according to his own views, is devoted to the maintenance of the Gospel of Christ, can have very much in common with an Atheist; and yet, by a curious sort of combination, we have persons of these utterly dissimilar opinions ready to make common cause together for the strange purpose of destroying the greatest Christian institution of the land. One half of them, I am sure, have no idea that they are endangering Christianity by this movement, but the remaining half know very well what they are doing, and how they are making a catspaw of the others, in order to accomplish objects which they themselves thoroughly understand. That men devoted to the Gospel should think that it is

a good thing to pull down and destroy the one National Institution which exists by public authority for the purpose of spreading Christian principle throughout the land, this surpasses my comprehension. The Established Church, by its influence on the rising generation in our schools, as well as by its more directly spiritual work in guiding devotion and preaching the Gospel, does build up and maintain Christianity where otherwise the knowledge of it might perish through ignorance and through a growing insensibility to the claims of a higher life. That such a man as I have described, who is himself a zealous professor of the Christian faith, should desire to undermine this Institution, and to do so from some sort of political opinion—an opinion which his Nonconformist predecessors would have indignantly repudiated—and that he should not be deterred by the applause with which his opinions are greeted by Atheists, and by others opposed to the whole existing order of society, this, I must repeat, altogether passes my comprehension. It is one of those enigmas which the strange constitution of the human mind sometimes brings before us, but which it is almost impossible for ordinary sensible men to understand. . . . Now, look with me for a moment at one point in our self-styled *liberators'* scheme for our improvement, that part namely, which deals with the old Parish Churches of the country. The printed scheme or programme I hold in my hand proposes that the ratepayers in each parish, and not the representatives of the United Kingdom in Parliament, are to decide what is to be done with each old parish church. Well, the ratepayers are a large body, and sometimes the clergyman in a particular parish in some town is getting old, and is not so popular as he was when he was young, and there is, perchance, a very popular atheistical lecturer just come down to the secularist hall. There are modern towns where I should not very much like to leave it to the chance majority, either of the electors for the borough or of the ratepayers, to decide the question to what purpose, secular or religious, the parish church should be turned. Such, however, is the plan of our 'Liberators.' It is to be referred to the ratepayers everywhere whether the old parish church is or is not to be used any longer as a place of Christian worship, or, if of Christian worship, amongst what body of Christians it is to be appropriated. Well, these are things that are so ridiculous to us in the present plan that I do not think we need trouble ourselves very much about them ; but still, even with

regard to such views as these, there are some of us who are old enough to remember the echoes of the French Revolution ; and I am not prepared to say that sudden and extraordinary changes may not come over even this sensible and great nation, and that our descendants may not have to curse our inactivity for not acting while there is time. It is the fashion nowadays, among a certain class, to say that it is an insult that in the government of the country there should be any sort of favour shown to religion. Well, I am afraid that the government of the country will go on very badly if there is no favour shown to religion ; because it appears to me that the government of all countries, even heathen countries, is based upon that modicum of religion, great or small, which it has pleased God to communicate. It is no use blinking the matter. If it is an insult that religion should be recognised in our laws, what business have we to lay down laws as to matrimony ? What business have we to say that the system of the Mormons is not quite as good as any other that could be introduced into social life ? We must, I think, refer to Christian principles in our legislation ; and, if the men with whom we are engaged in this contest are prepared to repudiate religion in the government of the country, I think they must drive it from the laws of the country ; they must drive it even from those laws which regulate social and family life ; and therefore I am not very much surprised to find that new views as to social morality crop up here and there where the sanctions of religion have been entirely repudiated, even in this well-ordered and moral community."

It was for some years usual among the advocates of Disestablishment to refer to the results of the measure of 1869 in Ireland as a potent argument in favour of a similar step, first in Scotland and then in England. The Archbishop alluded as follows to these arguments at a meeting on behalf of the Irish Church Sustentation Fund, held in May 1879:—

"There is a difficulty which all of us feel when we speak upon the subject of Disestablishment. It will not do always to speak as if everything were perfectly prosperous, because, if the fears of our friends in Scotland have any foundation, we are perhaps not quite done with Disestablishment. Somehow or other the

thing is in the wind. Now, did you ever notice how consummate is the art of our opponents in this particular matter? If you say the Irish Church has prospered very much under the late change, 'Oh,' they say, 'see how much better you would do if you were disestablished.' If we say it has not prospered, they say, 'What a beggarly system that is you belong to, which depends upon Acts of Parliament and paltry money considerations in order to maintain its way in a great Christian country.' Then, again, their art is not small in the way in which they appeal to the feeling of individuals. If you are a High Churchman, what an admirable thing it is, they say, to be relieved from all law. Law, they add, is the next dangerous thing a man can possibly be subjected to, and if the Church were only disestablished you would hear no more about law. If you are a Low Churchman they say, 'See what charming things the Irish Church has done now it is disestablished. Surely you won't hesitate to cast in your lot with us, when you have the prospect of obtaining all the many advantages in a Protestant direction which the Irish disestablished Church shows may be attained if you will only get rid of the State.' That puts us in a difficult position in advocating the claims of the Disestablished Church of Ireland, and the right and wise way of meeting the difficulty is to confine ourselves to the sober truth—to take a practical view of what has really taken place—to admit to the full any good, if such there be, that has actually arisen from the change—but still to maintain our unalterable opinion that we both in England and in Scotland are very much better without such a change, which would indeed be a national disaster with wider consequences than any man can yet foretell."

Few things, perhaps, were happier in his public utterances than the references he was frequently called upon to make to public men who had passed away. It would be impossible to multiply quotations of this character, but as typical specimens of such allusions, a few sentences may be reproduced from two significant speeches, one in Convocation, the other in the House of Lords, with reference to the deaths of two Bishops from whom he constantly differed upon public matters, Bishop

Wilberforce and Bishop Selwyn. Speaking in Convocation, on May 14, 1878—

“It is very difficult,” he said, “to estimate the loss which the Church of England has sustained by the loss of Bishop Selwyn. A certain romantic halo was around him, and was reflected from his person to the Church of which he was one of the chief governors—so that all who belonged to the Church were proud of him. It has been said that perhaps some of those who had to do with him in his administration of the diocese of Lichfield might have liked the calmer and more prosaic modes of administration to which they had been accustomed; but I am certain that any one who was much in his presence, or who associated with him in his diocese, will be ready to acknowledge him to have been a veritable king of men. He was one who was qualified alike by nature and by grace to command the hearts and sympathies of those over whom God had placed him, and it is impossible in this practical age to over-estimate the advantages which the Church derived from the existence amongst its rulers of such a man as he was.”

Of Bishop Wilberforce, who had occupied an even larger place in the eyes of the English Church and nation, the Archbishop spoke thus in the House of Lords on July 22, 1873:—

“I can well understand that my noble friend (Lord Granville) should have found it impossible yesterday to address your Lordships, fresh as he then was from the scene of a great calamity—if we may call it a calamity for a man to be summoned away in the midst of his vigour in obedience to a Voice which he had long expected, not unprepared, but ready for the summons. My Lords, I have known the right rev. Prelate for upwards of thirty years. I received from him long before I was a Bishop many marks of kindness, and for seventeen years I have seen him almost daily in the discharge of our respective duties. It has been my misfortune to differ from him often, but I never knew an occasion on which his kindliness of heart did not overcome any difference which might have arisen from a divergence of opinion. I ask myself, what is the mark the right rev. Prelate

will leave upon the Church and the people of England?—for I cannot doubt that one who filled so conspicuous a place in the public estimation, and who was seen and heard everywhere with pleasure and advantage, must leave a lasting mark behind him. He was not, indeed, the writer of a great work; nor, as far as I believe, was he the founder of any great school of thought; but he did set before the Church of which he was an ornament, and before the people of England the example of a life devoted to duty in its lowest and its highest phases. He was as ready to befriend the curate, whom no one knew but himself, as he was to place his services at the disposal of your Lordships, or of his Sovereign. No man could discharge such duties as he fulfilled in this spirit without leaving a lasting mark behind him. I believe I am only speaking the sentiments of all my brethren on this bench when I say that there is not one of us who does not feel that we owe to him a debt that we can never estimate fully, in the example he has set us by his untiring energy. Many Bishops before him strove earnestly to perform their duty; but I believe that they, if living, would be as ready as myself to say that no one ever laboured so emphatically or left behind him such an example of untiring industry in every department of work he undertook. It was this, my Lords, that gave him his surpassing influence. It was not merely an aptitude for business and a devotion to the details of business, such as no man, perhaps, but himself in this generation ever showed, but it was that kindly sympathy with which he entered into the feelings of others—that readiness never to spare himself if he could do an act of kindness—which made him ever welcome wherever he showed himself. I am sure that, publicly and privately, all the people of this country will, for many a day to come, lament the misfortune which has deprived us of his presence and his services—though we cannot and dare not for his own sake lament his departure from among us.”

Perhaps it may not be inappropriate to subjoin in this connection, two letters which he wrote a few years later, on the publication of the first and second volumes respectively of Bishop Wilberforce's Life. The third volume, which has been the subject of so much criticism, was not published until within a few weeks of the Archbishop's death.

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Mr. Reginald Wilberforce.

“ADDINGTON PARK, Dec. 30, 1879.

“MY DEAR REGINALD WILBERFORCE,—I determined, when I received your kind present of the first volume of your father’s life, to read the book before I acknowledged it, if I possibly could. And now I have finished it, and cannot resist telling you that I think both your family and the public may be perfectly satisfied with the way in which Canon Ashwell has done his work. I confess that before I read the book I had my misgivings lest Ashwell should not have proved equal to his task; but I do not at all think so now. He has brought out a marvellous picture of untiring energy, and of a power of work such as I think is almost unequalled in the history of the Church. At the same time he has done full justice to the tender under-current of deep religious feeling which was the real spring that set the whole life in motion. He has been perfectly fair, so far as I can see, in allowing the public to judge of the motives by which his subject’s actions were guided; and, though he himself is enthusiastic in his approval of the rightness and wisdom of each act, he allows his reader full opportunity of judging for himself. Certainly the Life seems to me calculated to do much good. After reading it, I feel much as I used to do after visiting your father at Cuddesdon—greatly humiliated when I think how little in comparison I am able to accomplish. I cannot doubt that a new ideal of a Bishop’s work was set before the Church by your father’s appointment. Perhaps it would have been fair to have made more than Ashwell has done of Bishop Sumner’s Farnham ordinations, and the great change inaugurated by Bishop Sumner in this respect; but still even here the writer shows an evident desire to show how great was Bishop Sumner’s quiet work, and how it was appreciated by your father. One point I will criticise. I doubt whether Ashwell has in his picture quite done justice to the geniality of your father’s character, and his power of attracting by his humour. If I may venture to say so, I think the social side of the picture might in the coming volumes be more developed. Also, I think it might be well if possible to recover the record of some of his most remarkable speeches and interpolate them in the book. My opinion in favour of the book is perhaps the more valuable because in so many important

matters I differed from your father in opinion, and was even brought into antagonism with him ; but knowing him intimately, and watching him closely from 1856 to 1873, I never can doubt that he was a wonderful example of conscientious work accomplished by surpassing energy, and was stirred to all he undertook by deep Christian principle. The outpourings of his secret feeling in his letters to Miss Noel are a revelation of his inner self for which the outside world was not prepared. These letters and his father's early letters to him give great freshness to a history the general outward details of which were before cursorily known to many, from the publicity of your father's manner of life. I think I may congratulate you on the book, and I feel what difficulty you will have in selecting a fit author for the coming volumes. Ashwell's death is much to be deplored.

. . . —I am, ever yours sincerely, A. C. CANTUAR.

"P.S.—I think the book will also do much good in showing how consistent in his Church views your father was, from the beginning to the end of his public life."

On the publication of the Second Volume two years later the Archbishop wrote :—

"LAMBETH PALACE, 20th June 1881.

"MY DEAR REGINALD WILBERFORCE,—. . . My impression is highly favourable as to the fairness of the volume in giving the Bishop's character as it really was. It is impossible not to be struck with the extraordinary influence which he acquired over Lord Aberdeen, and with the intimacy of his relations with all the leading politicians of the Aberdeen school. I think he is unkind in his estimate of Lord John Russell, and his view of Archbishop Sumner appears to me to be founded on a complete misapprehension of the man he is speaking of. Obviously he is not fair to the Evangelicals ; but to his own principles, as opposed to extreme High Church, he seems to me consistent throughout. The Broad Church I think he did not understand, and he is rather rash in some of his statements about them. As to myself, I come off better than I could well expect. I am bound to say he was always kindly and generous when, as was so often the case, we differed. You have, I think, given a faithful picture. Some no doubt regret that it is so accurate ; but in the

estimate of the character in all its lights and shades the book is truthful and good. I only miss one point, which I hope the third volume may bring out more fully—the social and irresistibly fascinating side, as displayed in his dealings with society.—Ever yours,

A. C. CANTUAR."

Sometimes, on such occasions as after-dinner speeches, the Archbishop used to make a vigorous plunge into some subject other than his own, as, for example, at the Royal Academy Banquet of 1880, when he brought upon himself an avalanche of correspondence by his allusion to the architecture of the London streets:—

"Before I sit down," he said, "let me beg the members of the Academy to consider with me for one moment a practical matter, quite unconnected with criticism, in which I think they may go hand in hand with all who wish to promote the highest cultivation of the inhabitants of this city and of England. In France there is a controlling hand which prevents Paris from being defaced by very hideous constructions. I am sure that the general effect of looking day after day upon a hideous building is debasing—I will not say demoralising. Why should any set of men in England be allowed at their own arbitrary will to insult the sacred precincts of Westminster Abbey, the Broad Sanctuary itself, by erecting a debased miniature of the dead-meat market in Smithfield? And why should a private person be allowed to overshadow the whole city of Westminster by a building akin to the Tower of Babel, not only in size, but chiefly from its being made of bricks, and being a mass of confusion? If a man wishes to give his tenants mountain air on the plain of London, surely he ought to be compelled by some higher authority to erect his monstrous tower according to some plan approved by the arbiters of taste."

The Archbishop, like Dean Stanley and some other of his friends, was, throughout his life, deficient in any knowledge or appreciation of music, whether vocal or instrumental. It was a matter therefore of some amuse-

ment both to himself and his friends when he was invited by the Prince of Wales to be a speaker at the great meeting held in St. James's Palace on February 28, 1882, to inaugurate the Royal College of Music. It so happened that, owing to the pressure of other work, he had not been able, before the meeting, to give even a few minutes to the preparation of what he was to say upon a subject so unwonted; and he whispered to a friend as he entered the Palace that he had never in his life felt so entirely at a loss. But he said his say, and found himself, next morning, to his amusement and surprise, credited with the very foremost place among the promoters of the Royal scheme, which has since been crowned with so ample a result. As a mere instance, therefore, of his quiet and ready promptitude in finding something to say, at a moment's notice, a few sentences may perhaps be quoted from his speech:—

“Your Royal Highness has suggested that I may be expected to say something as to the importance of music in reference to our religious worship. One point, perhaps, I may dwell upon, which is this. Amidst those great diversities of opinion which exist amongst religious men in this free country, there is a wonderful power of uniting us together in that particular department of our worship, to which His Royal Highness the Duke of Edinburgh has alluded. We could not very safely borrow each other's sermons, for we might become terribly unorthodox . . . but this we are able to do, to use the same hymns, and to join in the same tunes, and thus music is in the truest sense harmonious, as uniting us together in the highest acts of our religious worship. Your Royal Highness has spoken of certain unfortunate people who are deaf to music. I am afraid I must class myself somewhat amongst that number, but I do not think on this account I am the less entitled to appear here to day. In fact, if it were only to be for musical people that you were to work, and only from really musical people that you were to obtain subscriptions, I am afraid that the sum you desire to obtain might fail. Therefore it is a very great advantage that you have some here who

are not ashamed to acknowledge that they desire that music should prosper, although unfortunately nature has denied to them the advantage of entering into its full enjoyment. Every man who is interested in education must, I think, be interested in music. Formerly education was divided into three departments, one of which bore the name of music, and although it may have included under that name many things opposite from what we now call music, yet still there was a recognition thus given of the high place which it ought to occupy in the education of a civilised people. Hence the old Universities have been encouraged to confer degrees in music; and perhaps your Royal Highness may not be aware that the humble individual who now addresses you has also the power of making a Doctor of Music. Of the many duties which I have to perform, that of making a Doctor of Music is one of the most difficult, especially as I am afraid that were I to subject him to an examination by myself, many unworthy candidates would obtain that high honour. Therefore it is very desirable that there should be some body, as the Duke of Edinburgh has pointed out, which, being a centre of musical instruction, should also be the centre from which musical honours proceed, and that therefore I should know where to come when I want to have my mind satisfied that a man is fitted for and worthy of the honour. A great change, it is said, has taken place in Germany in the course of the last hundred years from the introduction of the Conservatoire of Music. It may be a long time before we see the actual results of the great meeting which is brought together here to-day; but, after all, one hundred years pass rapidly in the history of a nation. Many of us here can look back half a hundred years, and if, in the course of this country's history it shall be found that even a long time is required to produce the full fruits of the effort which is begun this day, we shall have no reason to regret that we have taken in hand, in the practical manner pointed out by your Royal Highness, the furtherance of this great work, which must be in every sense beneficial to the nation."

Not a few of the speeches which have been quoted in this chapter bear upon the relation of the Church of England to those outside its borders. And, indeed, there was scarcely any period in his public life in which he was

not concerned more or less with this particular problem. He had to face it in the Oxford University Commission of 1850, in the evangelistic work of his earlier London years, in the legislation for removing the disabilities of the Scottish Episcopal clergy, in the recurring battles over University Tests, in the debates on Mr. Forster's Elementary Education Act, in the painful strife aroused by the Revisers' Westminster Communion in 1870, in the missionary difficulties of Madagascar, and, above all, in the long and stormy Burials Bill discussions, extending over nearly twenty years. Abundant accounts have already been given of the line he took, whether as Dean, or Bishop, or Primate, when such occasions came; but a few more pages on the subject may perhaps be pardoned as a part of the attempt made in this chapter to gather up some of his sayings and doings which do not fall naturally under any of the former headings.

In the summer of 1876 he occasioned a good deal of stir in ecclesiastical circles by arranging for a private Conference at Lambeth with some twenty of the leading Nonconformist ministers. The conference was the outcome of communications which had passed a few months before between himself and such Nonconformist leaders as Dr. Stoughton, Dr. Angus, Dr. Morley Punshon, and Mr. Newman Hall. Encouraged by a speech the Archbishop had made in Convocation, they had pressed upon him the gain that might follow from his presiding over a joint meeting of Churchmen and Nonconformists to discuss the best method of combined action in face of "the progress of irreligious thought in England." The Archbishop gave an encouraging reply, but he found on consulting his Episcopal brethren that some of them were strongly opposed to such a conference upon the basis which had

been suggested,¹ and that if he was to act at all it must be upon his own responsibility. He accepted the position, and on July 24, 1876, the Conference took place at Lambeth. It was attended by six Bishops, twenty-two English Non-conformists, and two ministers of the Established Church of Scotland.² The proceedings were not made public, but notes of what passed were preserved, and if the judgment of those present may be relied upon, the result was so satisfactory as to justify to the full the Archbishop's confident anticipations of success. The warmest tribute was borne both then and afterwards to his conduct of the proceedings from first to last.

"Your Grace's action," wrote one of the ministers who attended the Conference, "has done more than you are the least aware of to allay the heart-burnings, to disarm antagonism, and to promote the unity of spirit for which we pray. It is not the mere fact of your having done what no one of your predecessors has attempted for the last two hundred years; it is the manner of your doing it, and the weight and wisdom of the words you spoke. Believe me, the indirect effect of Monday's gathering will outlast our lives."

This was not the only endeavour made by the Archbishop to promote harmonious co-operation with ministers of other denominations. He repeatedly urged upon the clergy the advantage, and even the duty, of such co-operation as is practicable, say, on the plat-

¹ Several Bishops were averse to friendly conference upon such a subject with any whose policy in matters of education was diametrically opposed to that of the Church of England, and who were active members of the Liberation Society.

² The list of those present was as follows:—The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Norwich, Gloucester and Bristol, Peterborough, and Bath and Wells—the Reverends Dr. Allon, Dr. Angus, Dr. Aveling, S. H. Booth, W. B. Boyce, Dr. Oswald Dykes, Dr. Donald Fraser, Dr. Newman Hall, J. C. Harrison, S. Hebditch, D. Jones, Dr. M'Ewan, G. J. Perks, Dr. Punshon, Dr. Raleigh, Dr. Rigg, W. Roberts, C. Stanford, Dr. Stoughton, J. Viney, E. White, R. D. Wilson, Dr. Cumming, and Dr. Robertson.

form of the British and Foreign Bible Society. In his final Diocesan Charge, he reiterated this advice as follows :—

“At home, important questions of policy may keep us apart. . . . But not the less is it our duty . . . to look out for occasions on which, notwithstanding our differences, we may act together for the spiritual good of the nations. The Church of Christ throughout the world would, it must be remembered, be deprived of a vast proportion of its worshippers, if we left out of sight our Christian brotherhood with non-episcopal congregations at home, and the overwhelming mass of such congregations in the United States of America. Thus I trust that we English Churchmen are learning more and more to realise once again that great idea which was so powerful of old to stir men’s hearts and make them help each other—that there is a vast community cemented by Christian faith and principle which, amid all national and other special differences, join together the whole body of those who worship God in Christ. . . . The Oxford revival of forty or fifty years ago conferred many benefits on English society. . . . Still I think this must be granted on the other hand—that the teaching thus introduced or resuscitated, notwithstanding all its claims to Catholicity, was and is based on a somewhat narrow system, and has confined Churchmen’s sympathies in the direction in which before they were ready to expand. My predecessors in the Episcopate had, I think, less difficulty than we should experience nowadays in welcoming the co-operation of such men as was Robert Hall in the days of our fathers, and wishing them God-speed in their labours to resist prevailing infidelity. . . . The existence of dissent from the National Church is a fact which we cannot overlook. We deplore it, but we cannot act as if there were no such thing in the land. . . . After all, it is something to live in a country the whole inhabitants of which, speaking roughly, acknowledge one Lord and Saviour, and refer to one Bible as the one accredited rule of their life and citizenship. . . . For myself, in the office which in the providence of God I have held now for nearly twelve years, I have certainly never experienced any unwillingness, on the part of our countrymen without our pale, to pay to the Church of England that deference which all Protestant Christendom awards it, as the chief bulwark of the reformed

faith against the assaults, on one side, of superstition, and, on the other, of an aggressive infidelity.”¹

In consequence of the Archbishop's well-known and often-expressed opinions on this point, he was repeatedly urged to take some action which would officially connect him with the Evangelical Alliance and other kindred organisations. When Bishop M'Ilvaine of Ohio, the foremost and honoured representative of Evangelical opinion in the American Episcopal Church, visited England in 1870, he made strenuous efforts to obtain some official letter from the Archbishop in connection with a great meeting of the Evangelical Alliance then impending in the United States. The Archbishop, however, in accordance with the position he had from the first taken up, contented himself with writing as follows:—

“STONEHOUSE, THANET,
June 20, 1870.

“MY DEAR BISHOP,—I cannot receive from you a formal statement respecting the proposed General Conference of Christians from all countries soon to be held in New York, without begging you to inform the President of the meeting of the deep interest which I feel in its proceedings. You are aware that I have never been a member of the Evangelical Alliance, but it is not possible for me to hold the position God has assigned to me in that Church which has generally been regarded as the bulwark of the Reformation, without praying for God's especial blessing on all earnest efforts to spread the great Gospel doctrines which the Reformers vindicated. I trust that the Holy Spirit of God may guide all who take part in your discussions at New York, and that the solution of the great social and religious questions of which you propose to treat may be advanced by the mutual intercourse of minds accustomed, many of them, to regard these questions in different aspects according to the peculiarities of their several countries. That God may hasten the time when the differences which at present tend too

¹ *The Church of the Future.* Charge of 1880. Pp. 13-19.

much to keep Christians asunder may be removed, and when all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity may be able, without compromise of any principle, to unite both outwardly and in spirit is my hearty prayer.—Believe me to be, my dear Bishop, your faithful brother in Christ,
A. C. CANTUAR."

A few years later a further effort was made (not quite fairly, as the Archbishop thought) to secure his adherence to the "Christian League," an organisation not dissimilar to the Evangelical Alliance. On this occasion the Archbishop wrote :—

STONEHOUSE, *Nov.* 25, 1875.

" . . . In the official letter [written on behalf of the League] it is stated with respect to myself that 'after hearing the object, method, and progress of the Christian League,' I expressed my 'approval of them.' This statement appears to me to go a long way beyond anything that passed at the interview which — had with me on the subject, and beyond anything I have said or written. So far as the 'Christian League' aims at bringing Christian people to a better understanding of each other's position, and leading them to look, more than they seem now inclined to look, at the essential doctrines of the Christian religion rather than at points of difference, I agree with the great majority of members of the Church of England in thinking the object a good one, but beyond this I am not aware that I have expressed any opinion as to the 'object, method, and progress' of the institution. . . . The Resolution which has been forwarded to me requests that I would receive a deputation at my convenience. Before agreeing to do so I must request to be furnished with a list of the persons who propose to wait on me, and a statement which shall enable me to know distinctly what influential bodies they represent. The cause of Christian unity is too important for me to allow it to be imperilled by any hasty or ill-advised step, and I cannot think that good would follow from such a discussion as is now proposed unless I were assured that the deputation would consist of really representative men who had the sanction of public opinion among those whom they represent."

In this same year (1875) the American Revivalists, Mr. Moody and Mr. Sankey, were in London. Thousands of people flocked every day to their services in the Agricultural Hall at Islington and elsewhere. Many of the influential and earnest promoters of the movement were disappointed that it was not more actively supported by the clergy of the Church of England, and requests poured in upon the Archbishop from every side that he would give some official countenance to "a work on which the blessing of God so manifestly rests." The Archbishop made minute and careful inquiries in all directions, and in the end wrote as follows to Lord Cairns, who had for several weeks been in communication with him upon the subject. The letter was published at the time, but without Lord Cairns' name :—

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Lord Cairns.

"STONEHOUSE, THANET, 18th May 1875.

"MY DEAR LORD,— . . . It is impossible for me, in the position I hold in the National Church, not to take the deepest interest in a movement which, seeking the spiritual welfare of our people, has been so wonderfully successful in drawing together great masses to hear simple addresses on the great Gospel doctrines. I have communicated on the subject with parochial clergymen of various opinions, and I am sure the movement is regarded by all of us with deep interest, and we pray that it may bring a blessing to many souls. Many of our parochial clergy, as you are aware, have been present at the meetings in question, and those who have stood aloof have done so, not from any want of interest, but because they have felt that, greatly as they rejoiced that simple Gospel truths were urged on their people's consciences, there were circumstances attending the movement to which they could not consistently give their approval. The missionaries have been at work in different parts of the country for many months, and for several weeks in the Metropolis, and their system is now generally understood. If

there is a difficulty in the clergy generally giving any official sanction to the details of the work, you will at once see that, in the case of the Bishops, there are greater difficulties in the way of any direct sanction, which, coming from them, could not be regarded as other than official and authoritative, and I confess that the objections I originally felt still remain in full force, now that we have had time to examine and to learn from various quarters the exact nature of the movement. That addresses urging, in whatever homely language, the great truths of the Gospel on our people's consciences should be delivered by laymen is no innovation amongst us, and I heartily rejoice that the present movement is conducted on so great a scale and with such apparent success. It is chiefly from the 'after meetings for confession of sin and for guidance of the conscience,' as they have been described to me, that I am apprehensive lest evil may arise. I cannot think that the delicate and difficult duty of thus ministering to anxious souls ought to be intrusted to any who have neither been set apart by the Church for this especial office, nor have given proof of such a spiritual insight as may in certain cases be held to take the place, in this particular, of the regular call to the cure of souls. I cannot but fear, from what I have heard, that the counsel given at these meetings must often be crude, and founded upon no knowledge of the real circumstances and state of mind of those to whom it is addressed, while there is danger also lest some self-constituted advisers of others may do harm to themselves, seeking to be leaders, when in truth they have much need to be led. I learn, also, that in the organisation for addressing God publicly in prayer, a great deal too much is trusted to the readiness of any one who may be present to accept, without due preparation, the grave responsibility of guiding the devotions of the multitude assembled. These objections are quite independent of others, which I have heard urged upon good authority, against particular statements as to doctrine said to be made without sufficient guard or explanation. I am not alluding so much to any depreciation of the ordinances which Christ has established for the edification of His Church, but rather to the allegation that, in the discourses of the missionaries, there are unwise and untrue representations of the almost universal necessity of instantaneous conversion, and an ignoring of the full Scriptural teaching as to the nature of repentance. I cannot but trust that, if these allegations be true, friendly remonstrance may

induce those who direct such missionary efforts hereafter, to avoid these obstacles to their real spiritual success. It has been said also, probably with truth, that the great majority of those who have frequented these services hitherto have been the ordinary worshippers in churches and chapels, and that comparatively few from the neglected masses of society have been reached. No doubt there is, among the respectable classes, much selfish and self-satisfied indifference, out of which it is well that the preacher's voice should startle them. But, I confess, I rejoice to hear that the missionaries have now moved to that part of London which is especially inhabited by the neglected poor, and I trust that it will be found that their congregations are gathered from such as have been hitherto strangers to the sound of the Gospel. I am aware that many of the most quietly religious people amongst us regard, not unnaturally, with alarm these irregular efforts; such persons have scarcely been able to approve even of the home missions, which have of late years been conducted by our own clergy in a way to which our fathers were not accustomed. But, looking to the vastness of the field that lies before us, and the overwhelming difficulty of contending with the mass of positive sin and careless indifference which resists on all sides the progress of the Gospel, I, for my part, rejoice that, whether regularly or irregularly, whether according to the Divine, Scriptural, and perfect way, or imperfectly, with certain admixtures of human error, Christ is preached, and sleeping consciences are aroused. In the Old Testament lesson for yesterday evening (Numbers xi.), our Church has brought before us how the great Prophet of the old covenant, when he heard that others beside those whom he had regularly commissioned were addressing the people in the Lord's name, exclaimed—'Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put His Spirit upon them!' This is the very lesson which the Lord Jesus Himself taught, when He told St. John not to forbid one who was casting out devils in His name, though he followed not with the regularly appointed company of the Apostles, saying—'He that is not against us, is for us.' It is, according to my judgment, in this spirit that we ministers of the Church of England are right to regard this missionary work. It is our part to trust and fervently to pray that God may guide all who speak in His name, that many, hitherto careless or directly opposing, may have their

hearts opened to the influence of the Gospel of Christ, and their lives regulated by His law; and I feel confident that our parochial clergy will not fail anxiously to assist all of their people who seem to be awakened by this preaching to a consciousness of sin, endeavouring to deepen all salutary impressions, and so to guide the course of each one's spiritual life that these impressions may not be passing.—Believe me to be, my dear Lord, very faithfully yours,
A. C. CANTUAR."

This letter was "a deep disappointment" to Lord Cairns, who had hoped, he said, for a far more official and cordial recognition of Mr. Moody's work from "one who had so long identified himself with Evangelistic efforts." But the Archbishop adhered to his position, and in a subsequent letter to another friend, who had remonstrated in similar terms, he wrote :—

"I have really gone as far as I conscientiously can (many of my friends think it is a great deal too far) in the direction of expressing approval of a mode of work which, as at present carried on, seems to me to be fraught with no inconsiderable peril, however great, and often real, be the immediate effect."

Again a few years passed, and again the Archbishop found himself compelled to give counsel both publicly and privately with reference to an "irregular" Evangelistic effort. This time it was upon a larger scale. The Salvation Army was coming into notice, and the clergy were necessarily puzzled as to the line they should adopt. The Archbishop referred more than one inquirer to the letter to Lord Cairns which has just been quoted, as applicable *mutatis mutandis* to the Salvation Army. At the same time he spared no pains to become acquainted with the facts. He procured, and read with the utmost care, the official booklets of the 'Army'; one of his chaplains, by his direction, attended all sorts of meetings in connection with it, and obtained information of every kind, officially and

otherwise, about its agencies and modes of work. The Archbishop spoke upon the subject both in Convocation and in the House of Lords, and with advancing knowledge his confidence in its methods rather waned than grew. But he repeatedly declined to take a distinctly adverse attitude, and, to the surprise and indignation of not a few good men, he was announced at last as "a contributor to the Salvation Army's Funds."

"Things have indeed come to a pass," wrote one of his angry correspondents, "when the head of the English clergy, the official guardian of our orthodoxy, the man who more than any other is solemnly bound to denounce, and if possible to extirpate, heresy and schism, sends a donation from the Chair of St. Augustine to promote the cause of the Church's most profane and mischievous foe."

But the Archbishop had done nothing of the kind. Among the vigorous enterprises of Mr. (or, as he had begun to be called, "General") Booth was the purchase for £16,000 of the lease of the "Eagle Tavern," with the huge "Grecian Theatre and dancing-rooms" in East London, in order to transform the premises to a religious use, for what is known as "rescue" and other kindred work. Rightly or wrongly, the premises in question had the character of being among the most notable centres of evil in East London, and the various competent judges from whom the Archbishop made inquiry were unanimous in their opinion that, whatever the tenets of the Salvation Army, the change in question must be a change unspeakably for the better. The Archbishop accordingly encouraged Mr. Booth's scheme, and authorised the publication of his name as a subscriber of £5, accompanying the subscription, however, with a careful proviso that he was not thereby expressing any opinion upon the larger questions of the Army's work. The officials of the

Salvation Army published the sentence conveying the subscription, but omitted the qualifying proviso. Misunderstandings at once arose, and the Archbishop thereupon sent the whole letter to the newspapers. The main importance of the incident lies in the fact that the Archbishop is still not unfrequently spoken of as having "subscribed to the Salvation Army," and thus given it his official sanction. The letter to Mr. Booth was as follows :—

The Archbishop's Chaplain to Mr. William Booth.

"LAMBETH PALACE, June 20, 1882.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I am directed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to write to you with reference to the letter he yesterday received from you. The Archbishop desires me to assure you that if it should be in his power to assist, by any influence with the Charity Commissioners or otherwise, the acquisition by your body of the site at present occupied by the theatre, tavern, and dancing-gardens in question, he will gladly further your wishes in the matter. You will readily understand that the innumerable claims made upon the Archbishop render it impossible for him to give you material assistance in effecting the purchase of these expensive premises. The question of the co-operation of the clergy of the Church of England in the actual work of your association is one of extreme difficulty. Without expressing at present any opinion upon that subject, his Grace has no hesitation in approving the acquisition by you of premises at present used for so different a purpose; and though his contribution can, as I have said, be only a nominal one, I am authorised to say that you may put down the Archbishop's name as a subscriber of £5, for which sum I enclose a cheque.—I remain, yours faithfully, RANDALL T. DAVIDSON, Chaplain."

About one other Nonconformist body, of American origin, a few words may perhaps be said. The small sect known usually as "The Reformed Episcopal Church" seemed not unlikely in 1878 to obtain a position of some prominence in England. A good many ill-informed

Churchmen were already allying themselves to the new body, under a vague impression that, though it was not exactly the old Church of England, it was something different from a Nonconformist sect. It was even stated that this misapprehension was encouraged in the periodicals of the new Society, if not by the dissenting 'Bishops' themselves. Some of the Bishops of the Church of England thought the matter so grave that they were anxious for a formal pronouncement from Convocation, protesting against the claim, or supposed claim, of these American sectaries to be a portion of the Anglican Communion. On May 14, 1878, a considerable debate took place upon the subject in the Upper House of Convocation. The Archbishop, who had more than once had to do with the matter before, was strongly opposed to the issue of such a protest as had been suggested. It was likely, he maintained, to give a wholly fictitious importance to this little community, and even to make it look like a sort of rival Church of England.

"The persons who have been mentioned," he said, "are at least believed by some to be more or less impostors—that is, persons who pretend to be one thing when they are another. That is a very dangerous thing to play at in England. . . . It is certainly unusual with us to have dissenters with Bishops, but it is not unusual in other parts of the world. I suppose every Oriental sect has not only a 'Bishop' but 'Archbishops' and 'Patriarchs' at its head, and yet they do not necessarily become orthodox. Therefore I am anxious that we should not magnify the importance of these people by letting it be supposed that we think they can make good the claim they have advanced, and that they cease to be what they are—a number of persons who are schismatics disturbing the Church of England. What the reasons may have been that have called these persons into more prominence than formerly we have not to go very far in order to find out. They are endeavouring to trade on certain dissensions which exist among ourselves. I trust that in anything that we

do we shall guard very carefully against exaggerating their importance, because I am sure they are not of importance, and whatever importance they may attain they will attain not by claims which they make of their connection with Dr. Cummins in America, but from their learning, if they have any, and from their exertions for the benefit of the souls of the people among whom they live. . . . I do not feel any great alarm about this invasion, and I should be very sorry if we let it for a moment be supposed that we have any alarm about it. A few eccentric people leave the Church of England every year. Some of them go to Rome and some to Dissent, and it is not impossible that a few ministers of the Church of England may join this particular body; but I do not know that we should be much the worse for that; and if they find the same field for their energies in this Dissenting body, perhaps they will do less harm than if they remained members of our Communion.”¹

It is only possible to allude in briefest terms to the Archbishop's connection with Reformation movements on the Continent of Europe and elsewhere. An account has already been given of the difficulties he felt in 1872 with respect to the Congress of Old Catholics at Cologne,² nor did he ever find himself able to accord to that movement all the sympathy which some of its English friends expected of him. With several of its leaders, however, he maintained friendly communication, and in 1881 Bishop Reinkens and Bishop Herzog visited him at Addington to discuss the progress and prospects of their work.³ With Père Hyacinthe Loyson, who, after the Lambeth Conference of 1878, placed himself definitely under the direction of the Anglican Episcopate, the Archbishop was for several years in frequent personal intercourse, and from his place in Convocation and else-

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, 14th May 1878, p. 180. For an account of the origin and history of the “Reformed Episcopal Church” see the statement of facts appended to the Official “Letter” and Reports of the Lambeth Conference of 1880.

² See above, pp. 82-85.

³ See p. 544.

where he commended to English Churchmen the duty of securing at the least a fair hearing in France for a reformer of such indisputable earnestness and power.

Of French Protestants he numbered M. de Pressensé and M. Bersier among his friends, and it is due to his repeated championship of an historic cause that the little congregation of French Protestants, descendants of the refugees of 300 years ago, still continues to hold its simple services in the crypt of Canterbury Cathedral assigned to them in Tudor days. Repeated attempts have been made from different sides to bring this anomalous arrangement to an end, as inconvenient, unnecessary, and out of date—nay, in the opinion of some critics, as savouring of heresy and schism; but the Archbishop perseveringly and successfully defended, as a matter of significant principle, the maintenance of this historic “shelter of persecuted Protestants” within the very walls of the Metropolitan Cathedral of England, and his weighty words upon the subject in his Charge of 1876¹ may be taken as embodying in a concrete form the deliberate opinions of his life:—

“I do not forget that in this Cathedral, though in an obscure corner of it, there still remains a memorial of those days when the Church of England, looked to as the Mother of the Protestant Churches of Europe, gave an asylum to our persecuted Protestant brethren who came from other lands. This memorial of the past may have become now little more than a sentiment, but it is a sentiment not to be thought lightly of . . . [if it] remind us of our connection with those who in distant lands maintain under great disadvantages the truths for which the Reformers were content to die.”

¹ Page 9.

CHAPTER XXXII.

EXTRACTS FROM DIARIES—HOME LIFE, ETC.

1879-1882.

OF the varied features of the Archbishop's life none was more marked than the intense warmth of his home affections. He enjoyed to the very uttermost what he loved to call "the bosom of the family," and the private diaries of even his busiest years are largely occupied with references to the details of his home and family life. It would be out of the question to reproduce these particular entries in anything like their real frequency, but some quotations from the diaries are (as has been already said) essential to any fairly proportioned picture of his actual life. The extracts contained in a former chapter concluded with references to the crowning sorrows which darkened first the spring and then the winter of 1878. Four years of his life remained, and this chapter will contain in chronological order a few selected extracts from the diaries of those years. They necessarily cover ground some of which has been already traversed in this volume, but they present its subject from a point of view which is not the same as that of the biographer, and they have thus a separate interest of their own:—

"STONEHOUSE, *Sunday, 19th January 1879.*—Yesterday a telegram announced the death of my dear brother James. His was a childlike character; God accepts and values in Christ the childlike faith. He used to express his delight in simple hymns, and Agnes, his servant, read the Bible to him regularly. He was

waiting for his decease, and his strength had gone. At 80 it is impossible to wish that his life of weakness had been prolonged, but the shadow of the grave, even from such a death, hangs darkly. How a thousand memories are awakened of past intercourse in bygone years."

"*LAMBETH, February 2d, 1879, Fourth Sunday after Epiphany.*—This week seems to have been endless—the excitement about Lightfoot's appointment, the leaving Stonehouse for this home, the interest of settling here with all its sadness. Holy Communion to-day in the Parish Church. Lightfoot's appointment to Durham opens a bright prospect; a man of really humble mind, of great learning and perfect scholarship; his influence will be like Cotton's in India."

"*LAMBETH, 3d Sunday in Lent, March 16, 1879.*—The great event of this week has been the Duke of Connaught's marriage at Windsor. I went down on Wednesday to the Castle, and was lodged in Edward III.'s Tower. Nothing could exceed the Queen's kindness in making arrangements to spare my feelings. I was left entirely to my own discretion, and as there were 80 people at the dinner in St. George's Hall, I thought it best to dine quietly with the Dean of Windsor. . . . Next day was a tiring day, as we had to stand fully two hours in the Chapel. The ceremonial is recorded in print. The Queen's kindness was again great in arranging that I should leave as soon as I pleased. By half-past four I was back at Paddington."

"*LAMBETH, Sunday, March 23, 1879.*—To-day I preached in Farrar's restored Church: 'Many other things truly did Jesus which are not written in this book, but these are written that ye might believe.' Thus pass the days and weeks. It was affecting to have Lord Hatherley sitting immediately below the pulpit to-day, and I came quite unexpectedly on the clause at the end of the Bidding Prayer, which nearly upset me, but I got well through. Took a class of working men in the old Vestry Hall, and talked to them for an hour about the events of Monday in Holy Week."

"*Easter Sunday, 13th April 1879.*—A week of quiet rest at Addington. The solemnity of the return to this dear place is great indeed. To-day at the Holy Communion in the lovely Church, adorned with all its Easter beauties, I felt the presence of the beloved ones very near. Thanks be to God for the blessed hopes of this day. At times I have felt as if it would be better

for my children that I should go; but we are in God's hands; He will do what is best for all of us and for His Church; and perhaps after all there is work for me still to do here."

"*Sunday, April 20, 1879.*—Have begun with L. and A. a course of English literature beginning in the 15th century, with Morley for our text-book. Have read the prologue to Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* and *The Prioress'* and *the Monk's Tales*. Have also made some way with Abbey and Overton."

"*Sunday, May 11, 1879, LAMBETH.*—We are back at Lambeth, having arrived on Monday in time for the debate [in the House of Lords] on the Sunday question, in which I spoke. Tuesday, an interesting meeting in the Library for the formation of a Young Men's Friendly Society on the model of the Girls' Friendly Society. Towards evening, about 6 o'clock, as I was sitting ruminating on the speech I intended to make at the Bible Society Meeting next day at Exeter Hall, D. came in and told me that Fisher¹ was dangerously ill. Ten minutes afterwards came a telegram to say that he was dead: a sudden blow indeed, for we had never heard that he was even ailing. The Church has lost one of its truest, gentlest, most loving, and yet energetic servants, and a most happy home is made desolate. I wrote to say I could not go to the Bible Society."

"*Sunday, May 18, 1879.*—This has been a busy week. Monday, Diocesan meeting at Sevenoaks; spoke. Metropolitan Race Course Bill in the House of Lords. Tuesday, Church of England Temperance Society in Lambeth Library; spoke. Wednesday, Festival of the Sons of the Clergy at St. Paul's. Thursday, Ecclesiastical Commission, Charterhouse, Cathedral Bill in the House of Lords; spoke. Habitual Drunkards Bill; took part in the debate. Friday, incessant interviews till luncheon. Great meeting of S. P. G. about new charter; I in the chair for two hours and three quarters. Debate in the House of Lords on Duke of Argyll's censure of the Ministry. Thankful to have a day of rest on Saturday. To-day, Lambeth Parish Church, and I am now starting for a confirmation at Penge. Lord Beaconsfield's announcement, on my request, that he would appoint a R. Commission to inquire into the Cathedrals is an important event.

¹ Archdeacon Fisher, Vicar of St. Mark's, Kennington, who had been Domestic Chaplain to the Archbishop at the time of his appointment to the Primacy.

It is now some 25 years since I wrote my article on Cathedral Reform, and perhaps I shall live to see my plans carried out. This Cathedral movement has excited a desire in me for some further work before I die."

"*Sunday, June 22, 1879, LAMBETH.*—A week full of business. Monday and Tuesday, Diocesan Inspectors' and National Society's meetings. Wednesday, to Southampton. Thursday, preached at the opening of St. Mary's Parish Church there, altered in memory of Bishop Wilberforce. Interesting service and meeting. Friday, Bishops' meeting, and long discussion in the House of Lords. Sad, sad news of death of Prince Imperial. Saturday, Crown Prince of Sweden to visit Lambeth. Meeting of Corporation of Sons of the Clergy. To-day preached in Parish Church. This day 36 years ago we were married. This day 30 years ago we were blessed by the birth of our dear son. These days of joy have been marked with rejoicing ever since, till last year, and now. . . . Thus, as ever, our greatest joys are entwined with our deepest sorrows, and if life is prolonged our bright days become the darkest; but in God's good time they will grow bright again, and we shall thank Him together that we were united and so blessed."

"*Sunday, July 27th, 1879, LAMBETH.*—This week I have sat to Richmond, and had meetings of the Nestorian Committee and of both divisions of Charterhouse; have consecrated four Bishops in St. Paul's, opened a Home for G. F. S. at Ascot, transacted the ordinary business of the Diocese, Province, and Primacy, and prepared a sermon which I preached to-day at St. Peter's, Cornhill. The Church was crowded from end to end. I received an ovation from the people as I drove away. One foolish young man knelt down and kissed the hem of my garment. I don't know whether any good is portended by all this appearance of popularity, or what it arises from. We live in difficult times. I have been reading, while resting, Tom Hughes on 'The Old Church: what shall we do with it?' God grant a happy issue out of present controversies!"

"*RENISHAW, 24th August 1879, St. Bartholomew.*—I have preached in Eckington Church to-day, 'Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil.' I don't think I have preached here since my illness at Rugby in 1848. Strange to come back, finding all things changed. Old Frank,

the gardener, now 88, is the sole remnant that I find of the old stock. It seemed to me like walking among tombs; but it is well to live with the past and with the future, and not to be engrossed with the present.

"Have finished *Lady Grissel*, a sad picture of the last century. Have also read almost the whole of *Philochristus*. I am not quite satisfied with it. Although it may be a good thing to dish up a minimum of Christianity for those who will not swallow the whole, I am inclined to think that if people will take as much as is here offered to them, they will be willing to take the whole. The miracle of Lazarus finds no place in the book, which leads to an impression that the authenticity of the Gospel of St. John is not included in the author's creed. To be sure he may plead that he does not profess to give the whole Christian story, and is as much entitled to give only a part of it as were any of the first three Evangelists. But on the other hand he is writing in the nineteenth century, and in London, after the question of the authenticity of the four Gospels has been long agitated; and therefore it may well be expected of him that he should explicitly declare his opinion for or against. He certainly must be classed amongst believers in the resurrection of Christ, and the somewhat fantastic form in which he clothes the realistic narrative of the sacred writings leaves a slightly unpleasant impression. But the book is good as far as it goes, especially the allusions to Jewish customs and contemporary history, if only he had taken the trouble to add references."

"*Sept. 21st, Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity*.—Since returning from Dover have been occupied with the examination of candidates for orders. The examination work has been almost entirely finished before the last two days, and, thanks principally to ——'s arrangements in the Chapel and in the Parish Church, a deeply devotional feeling has been called forth, specially during the last days."

"*Sept. 27, 1879*.—A long round of Diocesan work, including a somewhat strange visit to Otford, where we toiled over the rather imaginary ruins of the Archiepiscopal palace till I was almost dead, and as nearly as possible tumbled into Thomas à Becket's well, reported to have been of great benefit to aged Archbishops in former times. The water would no doubt have been pellucid and refreshing but for weeds and a dead mouse.

"On Monday last I had a merciful escape, my horse falling as I mounted."

"5th Oct. 1879, ABERGWILL.—This Episcopal house is full to me of memories of our visit to Bishop Thirlwall 20 years ago, when I was preparing my first London charge. We have a great party in the house preparing for the Church Congress. — wrote to me to-day a touching letter. How much better are some men than their creed!"

"9th Nov., ADDINGTON.—Monday, I was at the opening of the new premises of S.P.C.K., and made a long speech. Lightfoot's sermon was excellent. Thursday, I gave away the prizes to the Oxford and Cambridge Local Examination candidates in the Hall of the London University, and again made a long speech. Friday, meeting of the Cathedral Commission. We made some marked progress. The days have scarcely sufficed for the endless correspondence. At night we have been reading the *Idylls of the King*."

"16th Nov., ADDINGTON.—Stanley has been with us this week. He is indeed a marvel from the out-pourings of his information. How strange that he should once have been the silent person whom I remember in earlier days.

"On Friday we had Archbishop Migherditch, the ex-Armenian.¹ Nothing could exceed in graphic interest the account he gave to Stanley, Davidson, and me, in the Library, of the excuses of the Consul as to a thousand pounds sent to him, which the Consul managed to lose: 'One week "he send money next day"; one week "he very busy"; one week "the banker gone to the villages"; one week "the post not go"; one week "he come into Aintab himself to pay it." How had the Consul lost the money? "He very fond of Arab horses; buy noble horses; go into the country among sheiks, buy, and pay £300, £500 for a horse; ride it a few days; sell it at Aleppo for £20." Then, as to his own conversion—[he had been an Armenian priest and then Bishop at Aintab, and the American Presbyterian missionaries had come to him. He did not think much of them, but some

¹ This ex-Armenian Archbishop had been long in correspondence with Archbishop Tait, and had come to England, in great poverty and distress, on purpose to consult him. The difficulty was how to encourage the old man's reforming zeal without allowing him to become a mere imitator of Anglicanism. The advice which had been given him by Bishop Gobat of Jerusalem did not altogether commend itself to Archbishop Tait.

one asked him to answer their arguments]. 'Wrote answer ; but conscience bad, not find answer good. *Think* Armenians wrong, but *know* Americans wrong ; they refuse Communion except to very few ; they select for baptism ; so I remain Armenian. But when sitting in my chair as Bishop, all Armenian errors seemed to come before my feet, as on a carpet, and lie there. I shut eyes and ears, but cannot shut out the thought ; there they lie. While in this mind, comes great letter from Constantinople : 'the Archbishop is dead, you must be Archbishop.' Goes to Constantinople. Patriarch says, "Catholicus of Cis is dead ; you shall be Catholicus." Answer : "No, I cannot." Patriarch says : "Cannot ? Why not ? It is the greatest post. You must." Knows not what to say ; cannot escape ; accepts ; comes back to Aintab very unhappy. Passing a house, learns that men met there to pray with a Prayer Book not Armenian. Interview with one of them. "Show me your Prayer Book." He trembles. "What do you want it for ? You Catholicus ; you will punish me." "No, I want to see it, not for punishment, but to learn." At last shown it. It was good ; no worship of bones ; baptism of children ; Lord's Supper open. Then read rules of their Church ; very good. They advised me telegraph to Archbishop of Canterbury. "Oh no," said I, "telegraph clerk Armenian ; he tells, I go to prison." Went to Constantinople. Saw Mr. — and others, who advised me go to Bishop at Jerusalem, Gobat. "What, then, is there a Bishop at Jerusalem for your Prayer Book ?" "Certainly." Then went back to Aintab. Soon the Patriarch finds out. A letter comes : "You must go to the Governor of Aleppo." The Governor, my friend ; meets me with both hands. "What do they say against you ? You are Armenian Archbishop." "No, not Armenian now, Protestant." Then he could do nothing for me. They took away my cap and my jewel (here the good man cried). Long business followed ; firman refused ; many persecutions.'

"Since then I have been in correspondence with Bishop Gobat, Sir Henry Eliot, etc., and a firman was granted for an Armenian Church of which he was to be pastor. Money was given by Mr. —, and embezzled, as alluded to above. The case is difficult. We all tried to comfort him as much as we could. I took him with me into the Chapel for a little prayer. He left me, saying 'I was dead ; you have raised me up,' and kissed my hand."

"23d Nov., ADDINGTON.—Have been reading *The Virginians*, Green's *History of the English People*, Cicero de *Senectute*, and the greater part of Luckock's *After Death*."

"ADDINGTON, 3d Sunday in Advent, Dec. 14, 1879.—Frost and snow; and many friends in the house—the new Bishop of Mexico, Bishop of Mauritius, Bishop of Bedford, and many others. Much information respecting the Mexican Reformed Church, and about the Spanish Movement, on which Bishop Riley has agreed to report. Bishop of Mauritius considers the Sultan of Zanzibar perfectly honest and straightforward in his dealings with us about the slave-trade, and to have been much influenced by his visit to England. Each day full of business, but managed to read a good deal of Green's *England*. Sir Rutherford Alcock and the Master of Balliol have also been here. Much interesting talk about China. Saturday occupied with despatches to the Bishop of Capetown, and the writing of a pastoral letter for our Church Building Society. I have been much interested in reading the last days of Bishop Dupanloup. Surely Romanism, even in the most devout souls, is something perfectly different from the religion of the Gospel. What should we think of any English Bishop who in his last illness requested that there should be a pilgrimage from the village to the Church at the top of some adjoining hill, or whose piety was marked by the continual repeating of the Lord's Prayer or *Ave Maria* over and over some fifteen or twenty times? So I understand the devotions spoken of. The writer may have misrepresented the Bishop. In one way he raises one's respect for his character by showing that he was a truly devout Catholic—more, after all, of a priest than of a politician.

"I have also been reading some account of Buddha."

"ADDINGTON, 21st Dec. 1879.—My 68th birthday. In two years if I live I shall have reached David's term. Labour and sorrow have in part already begun, but, thank God, I have strength to preach. To-day preached at Bromley, and baptized at Addington Charles Goschen's son and heir. Lord, sanctify my old age! Make me to live more in prayer."

"Christmas Day.—Have been reading much of the first volume of Bishop Wilberforce's Life. It seems to me very ably and very fairly done. Of course it is quite open to any one to dissent from the somewhat too laudatory verdict which the writer forms

upon every act of his subject, but the facts on which he forms his verdict are stated with great fairness, so that every reader is able to judge for himself: *e.g.* the Hampden affair at the end of the volume. None but a fair biographer could have inserted that most caustic and condemnatory letter from Harry of Exeter—sarcastic vituperation under the guise of patronising friendship. The Bishop's continual letters, pouring forth his inner feelings, seem to have been a great help to him in all the bustle of his outward activity. The activity is absolutely marvellous; indeed, I think, morbid—caused by the shock of the break-up of his family life."

"*January 4, 1880.*—This week the news of the breaking down of the Tay Bridge with a railway train.

"—— gave an excellent address at our Chapel service at the close of the year. I could not deliver an address, as in old days, in Church. I felt I should break down.

"I have had a most interesting talk with —— on the religious state of Oxford. It would seem from what he says that there are numbers of young men who could easily be influenced to give themselves to the clerical life if any man of real power of influencing them, like Arnold, were to appear there as a teacher. The only person with power of influencing in this way is King, but his theological opinions do not perhaps attract the more intelligent, and, according to ——'s account, many young men who might be led right, sink into a sort of hopeless Agnosticism or indifference from the mere want of powerful guidance. I cheered him by saying that the right man would spring up some day, and that in a University, as shown in the case of Newman, it is wonderful how one man with great powers can affect a whole generation."

"FULHAM PALACE, *Sunday, January 18, 1880.*—I am in the room which we occupied 23 years ago when we came to see Bishop Blomfield before my consecration. The place looks much the same through all changes, and as the sun shone out bright this morning, the garden seemed the very picture of a place suited for a Bishop of London. Every turn is full of sweet memories. Very few faces in Church which I recollect. Old Miss ——, and Griffin the beadle, despoiled by modern parochial economy of his splendid garments, and one or two others."

"BISHOPTHORPE, YORK, *Feb. 1, 1880.*—Last Wednesday off to Leeds to preach at the consecration of the Hook Memorial

Church—'These all died in faith, not having received the promises.' Preached entirely from notes, by D.'s advice. Vast number of clergy present. It seems as if I were always harping upon the same strain, but perhaps this is necessary for these times. Great luncheon afterwards, at which again I spoke. Also dear Lord Hatherley, a most gentle, touching speech.

"Visited Dr. Gott's Clergy School and addressed the students on the old theme; but marking this, that the true tolerant catholicity is greatly opposed to indifferentism, and is based on the hearty belief of those few simple Gospel doctrines which we feel must support men in death, and on which if they are wise they will live.

"Large party in this house, which would have been larger had it not been for the mourning at York on account of the Dean's death. Walking in the garden here, among the old trees and by the river, have had many thoughts of former visits, and of that October day when we came to it in 1862, anxious whether or not we should accept Palmerston's offer of a change from London to York. How fleeting is life!—a pilgrimage. Thank God for the better land in view."

"*LAMBETH, 10th Feb. 1880.*—On Monday, read in the paper before opening my letters the death of dear Frederick Oakeley—at one time one of my nearest and dearest, and always one of my most revered friends. How I felt the separation caused by his secession to Rome! Many years have kept us apart, but always since I came to London I have tried to see him often, and these renewals of old intimacy have been very precious. He was a man of God, and sacrificed all the world holds dear to conscience. Sad that it should have led him astray."

"*Feb. 22, 1880, LAMBETH.*—On Friday presided at tremendous meeting of S.P.G. The whole street full of clergy from the country. Details recorded in the *Guardian*. Thank God, what threatened to be a break-up of the Society passed off well. Abp. of York and some six other Bishops present with me.

"Ordination candidates all this week. Addresses in Chapel daily—Fremantle, Knollys, Plumptre. Saturday, address by myself, 'In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength.'"

"*4th Sunday in Lent, March 7, 1880, LAMBETH.*—Dean of Canterbury here this week, and Dean of Durham; Constables, Bishop of Truro and Bishop of Colombo. I am thankful to say

our Colombo advice seems not unacceptable to either party, and by God's blessing I trust good will flow from it.¹

"Yesterday I was hard at work at the Cathedral Commission from 11 to 4, and from 6 to 8 was dictating an answer to a pamphlet of Mr. Hubbard's.

"To-day, the Chapel Royal, St. James's; Holy Communion. Excellent sermon on 'Modern Phases of Thought,' from the Bishop of Carlisle."

"*March* 14, 1880.—The dissolution of Parliament having been announced, involving the dissolution of Convocation and a general dispersal from London, we have resolved, being excluded from Addington by repairs to the drains, to go abroad. I want a quiet time to prepare my Charge—very difficult to find in this hurrying life."

"PARIS, HOTEL WINDSOR, *Easter Sunday, March 28th*, 1880. —Have been each day to Dr. Forbes's Church in the morning. Three excellent sermons from him, full of spirituality and powerful. Have been almost every day to the Madeleine. On Good Friday, crowds of people to listen to the preacher. On Thursday, crowds also, but rather to walk through the Church and pass the 'Tombeau.' Romanism is certainly not dead, either for men or women in France, and I suspect that the Freycinet Government will find they have made a mistake if they bully the Jesuits, as Bismarck has found before them. Outside the Churches, very little sign of such Romanism as in Belgium.

"Yesterday, to Belleville, to visit Miss de Broen and her Mission—a self-denying work. Ladies from England and Scotland come to stay with her and help her. Visited with her some of the poorest houses. Wretched hovels stowed away in what ought to have been the back green of a large house in a narrow street. Some hundred human beings have their lairs in this alley. I do not think they seemed very much pleased to see us, but Miss De Broen, with great tact, inquired for a certain Madame P., and this set the whole neighbourhood disputing with shrill voices whether the woman had ever lived there and where she lived now. And so we could look into many of the houses—wretched dens. At the entrance of the alley was one into which they asked us to go, as there was a 'pauvre malade' there. He was a man about 60, dying of consumption, dreadfully

¹ See p. 355.

ill, his wife waiting kindly on him. Poor body, I asked her whether she had any children. She said she had a girl of 17 lately dead. I knelt down and said a short prayer with them in French.

"The Tuileries ruins and the charred Conseil d'Etat on the other side of the river, a sad sight. Yet when we think of the misery of Belleville, and the little intercourse between rich and poor, and the way in which, as represented to us, even priests and sisters of charity come little to the poor people, except when they are dying, it is scarce wonderful that fits of frenzy should seize those who have nothing to lose, and that in their frenzy, unrestrained by religion, they should vent their spite and fury upon everything which spoke of the opulence and selfish comfort of those above them.

"To-day, Easter Sunday, somewhat secular in the outward appearance of the city. At Dr. Forbes's Church more than 400 communicants.

"This afternoon Mr. Yeatman took me to Père Hyacinthe's chapel. It is an old music hall near Montmartre. The people quiet and attentive. When D. and the girls went on Good Friday there was scarcely any service of prayer, and the people talked as in a theatre, but to-day there was no irreverence of this kind. In fact, the whole arrangements to-day were different, for we commenced with a service of prayer, praise, and reading of the Bible, which occupied a full half-hour. The altar was decorated with flowers and the candles lighted. The sermon was a marvellous effort—a sustained argument throughout, interspersed with passages of great devotional feeling and pathos. The subject was the saying that Christianity rested on a *tombeau vide*, the fact being taken for granted as historically true. The modes of accounting for it were examined one by one—the 'mensonge' of the Jews—the older Rationalists' theory of a swoon from which the Lord awakened. The strictly authentic character of St. Paul's testimony was examined. The fact of all the Christian world resting in faith on the doctrine of the Resurrection was amplified, with a reference, somewhat doubtful in taste, to the great Anglo-Saxon communities clustering round the throne of the *alterius orbis papa*. Towards the end there were two very striking passages: one, a hand-to-hand fight with a captious Materialist, who professed to know all about matter, and was proved to know nothing about its hidden properties; the other, on the Lord's treatment of

Thomas, as to how conviction may come to the Positivist of the present day.

"Thank God for a very interesting week. Dear thoughts of the loved ones who were with us so many Easters till the last. May God be with us in this journey and make it answer the purpose for which it was intended!"

"PAU, *April 4, 1880, First Sunday after Easter.*—We have now been here some days.

"On Monday, in Paris, D. and I. had an interview with M. Bersier in his own house. He certainly speaks much more favourably than other people of the state of religion in France; one of his arguments, that Atheism can but little prevail, being based on the fact that in the various cemeteries (and he takes care to make inquiries whenever he officiates) the number of civil (*i.e.* non-religious) funerals is a most insignificant percentage. He thinks the overwhelming majority of the people are believers in God and in another life. . . .

"We got back to Hotel in time to find Père Hyacinthe Loyson waiting for an interview. We talked much of his coming to London in June, recommending that he should give four lectures, say in St. James's Hall, on philosophical or religious points now agitating the public mind, and should have one meeting at the close to expound the exact position in which he and his affairs now stand. Whether or not he ought to have a religious service in the Abbey was left undecided. He had got into his head that Renan was lecturing in the Abbey by the Dean's invitation!! Certainly when one travels through France and sees how attached the people are, who make any outward profession of religion, to the ceremonial of Romanism, it would be a thousand pities if an honest attempt to purify these ceremonials were allowed to drop through.

"Next we went to seek an interview with Pressensé, but he was out of town. Called at the Embassy. Conversation naturally turned on the expected Anti-Jesuit decrees. A very doubtful experiment—to fish up old laws which had slumbered for so many years. Since we left Paris the decrees have come out, and there is a great commotion; no man can tell what the result of them will be if they are really put in force. It seems an awkward thing for a moderate Republican Government to have allowed the return of so many Communists and then to expel so many religious teachers by force. The general opinion seems to be that the

Priests will all stand by the Jesuits, considering the decrees as the outcome of Gambetta's motto—*Le cléricalisme c'est l'ennemi*.

"*Tuesday*.—Paris to Tours. Much interested in the remains of the great Church of St. Martin at Tours. The Saint's tomb covered with votive offerings. Then, full of enthusiasm for 'Quentin Durward,' to Plessis-les-Tours, represented by a modern brick castellated villa in the worst style of houses round an English watering-place. Drove off in disgust, satisfying ourselves with taking each old house we passed as the residence of Oliver le Daim.

"Reached Pau on Thursday. Our resting here reminds us much of pleasant days in Switzerland two years ago. How the thought of these days and that dear intercourse comes back! Surely family love like ours must last for ever."

"PAU, *April 11*.—Very busy all this last week with my Visitation Charge. Preached to-day for C. M. S.

"Have visited the old capital of Béarn, Lescar, with its quaint Cathedral. Below the Cathedral, once a Jesuit seminary, now a great training college for lay schoolmasters. Have also been to Morlaas and visited the schools for boys and girls. Most intelligent Frère at the head of the boys' school, with two assistants, also Frères. They have entire command of the education of the town, there being no Communal school. Government inspects them all, but apparently very irregularly. Their regular inspection is from the head of their religious order. The class-books distinctly religious; so the crucifixes, etc., on the wall. The Frère, a really intelligent fellow, was delighted when D. told him who I was. Explained that the Frères got possession of the district by underselling the Government schoolmasters; and the Commune, which is free to act, is glad to take the cheapest.

"Afterwards visited Girls' School at ——. Curious old Sœur at the head. Buildings wretched. The poor old lady seemed rather scandalised and altogether upset at being told that I was an Archevêque and that these three girls were my daughters."

"*April 18th*.—The girls and D. went to Lourdes, which it was not thought right that I should visit! In the train D. had a great deal of conversation on the subject of the Miracles with a most intelligent priest. His argument was that nothing could be urged against them, the evidence being very much the same as that for the Resurrection! He added that a Committee of

lawyers, divines, and medical men, had examined into the whole subject, and those who were most unwilling to believe had been brought by evidence to acknowledge the truth.

"With the aid of A. as secretary, I have written four and a half of my Visitation Addresses. The calmness of the life here has been a great refreshment, notwithstanding the excitement of the home elections. May the Lord guide His Church and our country in the somewhat anxious times which seem to threaten on the return of Gladstone to the head of affairs, with a majority so reckless of all but party politics."

"*LAMBETH, 2d May 1880.*—Back again after nearly six weeks. *Monday*, Bordeaux; *Tuesday*, Paris; *Thursday*, home. *Friday*, opening of Convocation. *Saturday*, consecration of Bishop of Newcastle (Australia). In the evening, Royal Academy Dinner. Many of the outgoing and most of the incoming Ministry. Speeches not much, except the President and Gladstone—he, sitting between his two tame elephants, Granville and Hartington, made an extremely good, quiet speech. My speech listened to because I spoke loud enough."

"*May 9th, Sunday after Ascension Day.*—This week Bible Society meeting, at which I spoke. Intercession Day on Rogation Tuesday, when with great profit I attended Wilkinson's service and heard him give some most useful advice. Ascension Day was spent at Addington.

"*Friday*, to Levee, with Knollys and D. Threw my three-cornered hat to the former, who had lost his, after I was done with it in the *entrée*, and unfortunately hit a general in the eye. Knollys was afraid he would call him out, but soothed him by telling him that it was an Archbishop's hat. He asked if there were any more coming."

'*STONEHOUSE, May 15, 1880.*—Heard on Thursday of the death of my dear Susie.¹ This leaves but one other family link with the past to be broken. She has been retained in life for nearly three years only by a half-divided chain, and now she is at rest. She was 16 when our mother died. She was a second mother to me. Taught me to read; was ever kind to me in my childhood, early youth, and manhood. Renishaw became to me a second and brighter home. How many recollections crowd on my mind now as I prepare to follow her to the family vault

¹ Susan, Lady Sitwell. She had been an invalid for several years.

at Eckington, where her body will rest beside her husband and her three sons. The gathering in of all my generation is fast going on. Raise my soul, blessed Lord, to Thy presence ! A door is opened in Heaven ; let me look in now and at last enter in."

"BALLIOL, OXFORD, *May 30, 1880.*—Preached in Chapel here to-day. 38 years since I ceased to reside ; just half a century since I first came up.

"This week in London has been very full of business. Monday, addressed South Eastern Railway Servants. Tuesday, Bishops' meeting. Wednesday and Thursday, Cathedral Commission, and Burials Bill in the House of Lords. Friday, many appointments. Public meeting in the Library about Wyclif and Ridley Halls, at which I spoke. In the evening long discussion in the House of Lords about Lord Ripon's appointment. Saturday, prepared sermon after other business, and came down here by 7 o'clock. Thank God I have got through my sermon here, which was on the whole very trying."

"LAMBETH, *June 6th, 1880.*—Last Monday spent at Oxford in seeing innumerable people, most of them old friends the worse for wear. Snell Annual Dinner in Balliol Hall, and speeches in Common-Room afterwards ; Shairp, etc. Tuesday to London by 11 for Holy Communion with Convocation in Henry VII. Chapel. Latin speeches at reception of new Prolocutor—Archdeacon Harrison, myself, etc. Convocation, Tuesday and Wednesday. Little business done beyond an address to the Queen ; but perhaps in the present electric state of the political atmosphere the less we do there the better. Thursday, Convocation for three hours, and long debate in the House of Lords on Burials Bill, in which I took part. Majority of 25 on my side."

"LAMBETH, *June 13.*—A very heavy week. On Tuesday met — at dinner, and had long talk about Burials Bill. He is not satisfied that another baby should have been substituted for his own of 1877. Wednesday, Cathedral Commission. National Society annual meeting ; spoke twice. Thursday, interviews and business all day long till I was nearly mad. Rode with A. to get my head cool. Friday, off by skreigh of day to Staplehurst and Cranbrook. Huge luncheon in Town Hall ; Lord Cranbrook, etc. Immense party at Angley Park, the home of the boyhood of Archbishop Longley ; beautiful place. Saturday, off to Addington, and home here by 7.30. A busy and, I hope, a useful week,

but without time for contemplation. Rather like travelling in an express train, and taking meals at the refreshment rooms during the ringing of the bell—not good if it could be avoided; it cannot. To-day a peaceful Sunday. Preached to an attentive congregation at St. Thomas, Lambeth. Thank God for the Sundays.”

“LAMBETH, *June 22*.—Our wedding day. Thirty-seven years since that bright summer morning when we went together to the dear little church at Elmdon. I have been alone in the Chapel here, thinking it all over after the day’s work was done. Amid blessings and trials how does life pass! Blessed Saviour, stand by me to the end. Blessed Father, into Thy hands I give myself and all I love.”

“LAMBETH, *June 27, Fifth Sunday after Trinity*.—Monday, consecrated Lamorbey Church; preached; luncheon and speeches. House of Lords. Wednesday, Père Hyacinthe’s lecture. Every day full of business. Thursday, very trying debate in the House of Lords on Third Reading of Burials Bill.¹ Friday, Cathedral Commission. Unpleasant meeting of the Church Defence Society, in which I was told I ought to be shot, but replied, summing up so as to put matters tolerably right, thanking them for their warm advice, and saying I would take as much of it as approved itself to my judgment.

“There is really too much to do this year. Everything is concentrated into so short a space, and, what with the rows in the House of Commons about Bradlaugh, and the generally heated state of the political atmosphere, things look very uncomfortable. We are waiting for the decision of the Government on the Bradlaugh case.”

“*July 4, 1880*.—On Monday at noon the great ‘Sunday School Centenary’ Mixed Meeting in the Guild-hall. The Lord Mayor in the chair. Spoke. Père Hyacinthe’s meeting at Lambeth in the afternoon. Wednesday, Wellington College meeting and Cathedral Commission. Thursday, great Sunday School Conference in Lambeth Library; spoke. Friday, to Windsor with deputation of Convocation. Sat next the Siamese Ambassador at luncheon. Found he understood a good deal of English, and was most intelligent. Saturday, great excitement. Prince and Princess of Wales here with all their five children; the Tecks, with three children; the Duke of Cambridge, the King of the

¹ See page 402.

Hellenes, Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress, and about 500 private guests, besides 21,000 children and an innumerable company of spectators. The rain, which came in tremendous gusts, cleared off for an hour while the Royal party were with us. I was dreadfully tired by the evening.

"At these great gatherings, and in the Windsor visit, how I missed the sweet presence of the past! Have been reading a sermon of Manning's on the faithful departed. May my heart be kept ever fresh by the memories of past blessings, and the assurance of the nearness of those I have loved and lost! Holy Communion in Parish Church to-day a great comfort. This great Sunday School movement calls for prayer. It seems to be the heaven which may preserve the land amid festering corruption. Five millions of scholars and 500,000 teachers must be a power for God, though there be many failures."

"*Aug. 8, 1880.*—Monday, great debate in the House of Lords on Gladstone's Irish Disturbance Bill. Never saw the House more full. Debate lasted two nights, and we did not divide till 2 o'clock on Wednesday morning. Robert Lowe, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Hatherley, and some 60 other Liberals voted against the Ministry. Gladstone having succeeded in reducing his majority from 170 to 60, the Lords thought themselves justified in rejecting his proposal by a majority of 231 to a minority of some 50, who supported him. Of these 50 more than half were members of the Government. . . . I have been reading a horrible article in the 'Fortnightly' on Bradlaugh; also Froude's 'Cæsar.' Otherwise nothing but talking."

"*RENISHAW, 12th Sunday after Trinity, August 15th.*—To-day I preached once more in the old Church at Eckington: 'The fashion of this world passeth away.' So life flows on.

"I have been reading a book containing the gist of supposed modern discoveries in anthropological science. It sets forth among other things the theory of Hæckel, that though no existing species of ape, either living or fossil, could have developed into man, yet probably some other ape, if we could only find it, would be such as might naturally become man. Only unfortunately we cannot find him or any trace of him, and probably the continent in which he lived was south of Asia in the Indian Seas, and has been submerged so completely that no trace unfortunately of such continent is to be found. And this is Science, which formerly I

had always supposed was based in its highest form on self-evident propositions, and in its second form on strictly observed facts.

"Another book I have read is an accurate inductive investigation, by Galton, into the genesis in particular families of Judges, Lord Chancellors, poets, and the like; intended, I suppose, to illustrate the mode in which they may be bred, like straight-backed Ayrshire cattle."

"*August 29th*, 1880, ADDINGTON.—Have read to-day George Smith's Chaldean account of Genesis. A world has been opened up by these researches of Layard, Rawlinson, and Smith. It is remarkable how the problems with which the Old Testament is occupied seem to have been present to the minds of those old people, and how similar traditions in aid of their solution seem to have been floating over all the East. The grotesque parts of the Assyrian traditions are not without their use, presenting a great contrast to the sober statements of the Old Testament. Surely there is a calm majesty about that Book altogether wanting in the others—much like the difference between the genuine and spurious Gospels."

"ADDINGTON, *Sept.* 5, 1880.—This has been a most important week. On Tuesday I held my visitation at Croydon. I am almost dead with the week's work in this hot weather. Entertained 200 clergy and all the churchwardens at luncheon. Thursday, to Tunbridge and Oxenheath. On Friday, which I had hoped to spend quietly after my Charge and another great luncheon, I was forced, by repeated telegrams from the Lord Chancellor, to rush up to London for the final settlement of the Burials Question, leaving Tunbridge at 4.30, and speaking in the House of Lords before 5.30. Thank God, the matter is settled, and I hope the excitement it has engendered will die away. The clergy have been much excited, and I think quite unnecessarily."

"ADDINGTON, *Sept.* 11, 1880.—Monday, to Dover. Two days of hard work—Charge, etc. Drove to Guston Church. In the middle of churchyard a cross like ours at Carlisle. Went up to it and found it was in memory of five children who had died at a farmhouse near, of scarlet fever—two within 24 hours. . . . That incident of the five children's tomb in the solitary churchyard has greatly moved me. They died in 1862,¹ six years after our sorrow at Carlisle. We never heard of the trial of these poor stricken

¹ The actual date was 1865.

parents in the farmhouse. How many mourners in this sad world quite unknown to each other and unlike each other, except in the sameness of their suffering! Thank God, there is a Healer of all sorrows."

'ADDINGTON, *Sept. 19th*, 1880.—After severe Diocesan round, got back here last Tuesday to find 29 Ordination candidates assembled, most of them in the house. Our neighbours most kind in taking in those we cannot accommodate. The week has been a very busy and very interesting one. A fine set of young men, but one or two comparatively shaky. Most of them seemed endued with good sound sense, and without theological eccentricities; a tone of earnestness and seriousness pervading the whole of them. Knollys, Pinder, Plumptre, Fremantle, and I addressed them. Canon Smith preached the sermon to-day in Croydon Church; full, I thought, of good sense and useful thoughts. I trust a blessing has rested on the week. My thoughts have been a good deal distracted by having my Visitation still only half finished, and feeling the necessity of throwing myself into the Ordination. This I think has been my 51st Ordination, and there has been a holy calm over the week, though I have at times, and specially to-day in Croydon Church, felt the loss of the dear son whom I ordained Priest there in 1875. Yet I would not wish him back. Sibthorpe well says: 'For such spirits to return to earth would be like Adam and Eve quitting Paradise.' Have been reading Sibthorpe's life—a truly devout spirit. Also finished this week Erckmann-Chatrian's *Brigadier Friedrich*. Written with much power; makes one love the French peasantry, and is calculated to stir up the bitterest hatred on the part of the French against the Prussians."

"*Sept. 26*, ADDINGTON.—Another laborious week. Visitation at Canterbury. Witnessed the Seneschal's exhibition of his fire-engine. Visited Clergy Orphan School; also new Middle-class Schools in progress; also King's School, junior and senior branches. Great luncheon given by me in Music Hall on Wednesday. Cathedral each day, till we left by Boat express yesterday. Thankful to be home to rest this day."

"*Sunday, Oct. 2d*, ADDINGTON.—Visitation at Maidstone. Charge on Tuesday; large meeting afterwards—M.P.'s, etc. etc.—on establishment of Church Institute in Maidstone. Visited Coffee Palace and Deaconess' Home—eight ladies working

indefatigably. Immense luncheon after Visitation on Tuesday, with presentation of Archdeacon Harrison's picture and many speeches. Back to Addington Wednesday, taking the Parish Schoolroom on the way, where the girls were exhibiting charades to the children.

"Thursday, Rural Deans and Archdeacons—27 to dinner. Discussion on Friday for five hours; more agreement on the Burials Act than I should have expected. To-day Holy Communion in Parish Church.

"I have thought much to-day of those sweet singings we used to have in the Hall. The gatherings there I remember, when recovering in 1870, I thought were a near approach to Heaven. We have never dared to have any since the loved ones left us."

"*Sunday, Oct. 9th, 1880.*—D. and I hard at work this week correcting my Charges for the Press. To-day Parish Church in the morning; our Chapel, afternoon. Read a good deal on Parable of King's Son's Marriage—Trench, Olshausen, Plumptre, etc., intending to preach on it; but suddenly in Chapel changed my mind. Finding that the First Lesson was the Vision of Dry Bones, addressed the congregation on the Vision, so full of meaning to us all. Have been reading more of Sibthorpe's Life. Would that I could grow more in the spiritual life! Lord, breathe upon the dry bones."

"*LAMBETH, Sunday, Feb. 6th, 1881.*—Here we are at Lambeth once more. This week I have scarcely been out of the house, being very much troubled with cough; and though I have been reading a good deal, my mind has been so much occupied by all the addresses, pamphlets, letters, and other disturbances, on the subject of the approaching meeting of Convocation, that I have been unable to give myself properly to anything else. God guide us all aright! There is a sort of repose in being back here, for at all events I am nearer my work. We are certainly in anxious times ecclesiastically, and not less anxious are they politically.

"House of Commons sittings this week signalled and disgraced by the uproar necessary for the ejection of some 40 Irish members, whose presence made debate impossible. They were roused beyond themselves by the committal of their confederate Davitt, to undergo the remaining years of his penal servitude."

"*Sexagesima Sunday, Feb. 20, 1881, LAMBETH.*—An interesting visit this week from Bret Harte. He said that Thomas

Carlyle, whom he had known well, had a great admiration for the Dean of Westminster, but rather enjoyed having a sly cut at him. 'There's that Dean, down in the hold, bore, bore, boring, and some day he will bore through and let all the water in.'

"Thursday, Ecclesiastical Commission and business all day.

Friday, a tremendous meeting in Willis's Rooms (I in the chair), for the alteration of the whole constitution of S.P.G. Every one in good humour, including the out-voted minority. I cannot help thinking that the clergy are upon the whole recovering from their excitement, and that the debates in Convocation have done good.

"A very spirited discussion in the House of Lords on Friday—Duke of Argyll and Lord Lytton. Each seemed to accuse the other of saying something that was not true, but as it did not appear in the discussion what either of them had said, it was somewhat difficult for us to arrive at a decision. Dizzy, with his usual tact, ended the angry debate and restored good humour."

"LAMBETH, *Septuagesima, Feb. 13, 1881.*—Monday, busy with many things in preparation for Convocation. Tuesday and following days entirely occupied therewith. Thank God, the spirit in both Houses has been very good—a desire for kindly treatment of eccentric people so far as it can be carried consistently with loyalty to the Church.

"HOTEL WINDSOR, PARIS, *Sunday, April 3d, 1881.*—Here we are again in our old Paris rooms. Thanks to Lord Lyons and Waddington we were able on Friday to attend a debate on Education in the Senate, and on Saturday in the Chamber. Scenes in both were curious, specially from the frequent interruptions: members shouting from their seats and joining in argument with the Speaker, prominently Jules Ferry, the Prime Minister. The ringing of the President's bell and the knocking of his hammer were frequent, though there was no excitement of debate; so what must be the case when there is really excitement we were left to judge. I took a dislike to Gambetta's appearance when I saw his picture in 1878, and certainly the actual sight of him, perched on his chair above the Tribune, did not improve the impression.

"This has been an anxious week in London, from Beaconsfield's dangerous illness, and has been made memorable by a splendid speech from Cairns against the African policy of the Government.

"CANNES, *Palm Sunday, April 10, 1881.*—Last Tuesday at Avignon. The Palace of the Popes has been sadly mauled inside by its division into sordid barracks. The whole place alive with soldiers on the move for Africa. A card sent to me in the Hotel 'J. Green.' Thought it was some bothering person whom I did not know, but was rewarded for my virtue in seeing him by finding my old friend, John Richard Green, the historian. He had just returned from Egypt, about which we had much talk. He was very interesting on the subject of the Pope's Castle at Avignon, and asserted that the enormous expense of it had been the cause of the Statute of Provisors, for the Pope, quite unable to pay the debt, invented the theory of his right to tax the faithful in other lands, and this led to resistance and so ultimately to reformation. Curious to note in history what consequences follow from the extravagance of monarchs. The building of St. Peter's paid for by the sale of Indulgences, and the sale of Indulgences established the Reformation. A similar train of thought forced itself upon me a few days afterwards at Marseilles, when looking at the magnificent Château d'Eaux, erected by Napoleon III. The building is in admirable taste, and must have cost an enormous sum. It was these splendid buildings in all parts of France, erected by borrowed money to keep the *ouvrier* quiet, which crippled and at last destroyed the Second Empire."

"BAVENO, *April 24, 1881.*—We stayed at Cannes over Easter Sunday, a day full of memories in that beautifully decorated Church among the palm branches. Archdeacon Blunt preached excellently. Tuesday, we left for Bordighera, then Alassio and Genoa, where we revived reminiscences. Heard of Beaconsfield's death. *Sic transit.* Visited the Campo Santo. Atrocious. We all agreed that if we were to lie there, we should wish to lie with the poor in the central ground, and not amongst the arcades filled with statues of the rich, the taste of which was the more strikingly abominable because of the beauty of several of the sculptures: e.g. a life-sized *avocat*, pleading in full fig, with out-stretched arm, while his mother in a Court dress wept below: a professor of surgery lecturing his pupils from his academic chair: a Member of Parliament, with tight trousers over tight boots, and a portentous watch-chain, looking ineffably business-like and bland: relations distractedly trying to force their way through the locked gates of their friends' tombs. Hardly a cross or a symbol of religion among them all, and certainly little mention of Christian-

ity among the many inscriptions. One scene of a whole family dressed in flounces and furbelows surrounding the deathbed of their father : another old lady placidly looking upon the surrounding monuments from beneath her corkscrew curls and a high comb. The whole made me think that Disraeli was right to prefer a quiet churchyard to even our Christianised Valhalla."

"LAMBETH, *May 8th*, 1881.—Thank God we are all happily at home again. The journey was tedious from its length, but wonderfully rapid. Crossed with more than 300 travellers from Boulogne to Folkestone. Thursday, the Queen's Drawing Room. Friday, innumerable letters ; British Museum election at Gladstone's house ; Sunday School Conference in Lambeth Library, at which I spoke. Saturday, consecrated church at Plaistow, and was on the point of preaching a sermon which I had carefully selected as appropriate, when, just as I was entering the Church, D. fortunately caught sight of a date written upon my notes, which showed I had preached it at the consecration of St. John's Church, Bromley, to the same clergy now assembled, exactly one year ago. The sudden discovery made me throw it aside and deliver a general address explaining the Consecration Service. D. declared it far more effective than the set sermon.

"Hurried back for a dinner at the Mansion House, given by the Lord Mayor to old Dr. Moffat, the African missionary, and some 300 persons interested in all the conforming and non-conforming missions of the day. The S.P.G. was well represented by Lord Nelson, Bishop Claughton, and many others. The President of the Wesleyan Conference sat between me and Lord Nelson. No doubt some people were nervous as to the collocation of Nonconformists and Church people, and no English Diocesan Bishop was present except myself. But I am sure I was right and wise to go. I cannot help thinking that the general impression produced must have been that when the Church of England meets all the Dissenting bodies thus harmoniously face to face, the great institution of the Established Church represents better than any of them, or all of them put together, the zeal and love and comprehensive spirit of Christian England. Dear Dr. Moffat was very interesting, but seemed likely to continue the reminiscences of his 50 years' work in Africa long beyond midnight, had not his octogenarian neighbour Lord Shaftesbury, more accustomed to measure the endurance of assemblies than the

solitary missionary, pulled him down by the coat tails after he had spoken half-an-hour.

"Have been reading Wilberforce's *Life* (vol. ii.). What labour he took to get Convocation to work ; how complete seemed to be the mastery which he had gained over old Lord Aberdeen through Arthur Gordon ; how strange the longings for Gladstone's succession to Aberdeen in the Premiership as the sure way for resisting Liberalism in Church and State. The accession of Palmerston must have been a dreadful blow to those who thus dreamed ; I don't know what they would have thought of the full-blown Gladstone of the present day."

"LAMBETH, *Sunday, May 22, 1881.*—All day in Convocation on Tuesday till evening, when Lucy and I had to rush down to Windsor to dine with the Queen. . . . The Queen told me she was reading my Charges, which rather astonished me. I told her I thought she would find them rather heavy, but she denied the imputation. Left early next morning to open Convocation. Received an interesting deputation of laymen and clerics—Nelson, Robert Few, Wilkinson, etc.—praying us to increase the lay agency of the Church in order to meet the growing infidelity and vice. We determined to refer the subject to the next Bishops' meeting. Convocation sat till three. Then to St. Paul's for Sons of the Clergy Festival, at which Montagu Butler preached. Then at 6 to Merchant Taylors' Hall for Sons of the Clergy Dinner. Spoke at tolerable length with, I think, a good deal of energy. Then at 10 to the Royal Concert at Buckingham Palace. Lovely music, but rather tired. Far too hard a day for an old worn-out man like me. It seems to me that having utterly collapsed on ordinary occasions, a strange vitality is infused into me whenever I get upon my legs to speak. But this Wednesday was too much."

"*May 29th, Sunday after Ascension Day 1881.*—This week has been very full. We had the consecration of Bishop Hose of Labuan, and seven Bishops officiating in the Chapel. Then drove to Addington to spend the evening of Ascension Day. Very tired ; could not keep awake for *Sartor Resartus* and the *French Revolution*. Off early next morning to Cathedral Commission, where stayed till it was time to go to a public meeting for East London, at which I spoke ; Bishops of London, Bedford, etc. Then to House of Lords, and at night 26 at dinner. On Satur-

day morning Holy Communion in the Chapel for Ecclesiastical Courts Commissioners ; many present. Meeting of Church Schoolmasters' Benevolent Society, at which I made a long speech in the open air. Very tired at night. Dr. Macgregor of Edinburgh with us ; much talk with him to-day on Scottish Church."

"LAMBETH, *Sunday, 10th July* 1881.—Monday and Tuesday, Diocesan Conference, occupying the whole day ; business-like and successful. Wednesday, C. M. S. deputation on Board of Missions. Annual Meeting on Church Defence, at which I spoke. Seventy-three people at dinner at Lambeth, with Sons of the Clergy, to meet Prince Leopold ; successful. Thursday, Ecclesiastical Commission and Courts Commission. Friday, Courts Commission ; slept at Fulham. Saturday, preached at consecration of Fulham Parish Church ; much exhausted. To-day, quiet."

"LAMBETH, *17th July* 1881.—This week has passed with all its usual incessant occupation here and at Canterbury, entertainments, prize-givings, Commissions, confirmations. But to-night all other thoughts are swallowed up by the dangerous illness of the Dean of Westminster."

"*24th July* 1881.—On Monday night the dear Dean died. I can say no more. It is vain to attempt to write. The speeches in Convocation, and the leading articles in every paper, and the sermons all over London to-day must be read to judge of the event aright. The week has passed heavily, the old routine of business. To-morrow is to be the funeral. Yesterday Agnes and I were at Addington—a day marked by the request of many hundreds, issued some six weeks ago, that it should be kept for humiliation and prayer."

"PITSFORD, *1 July 31st, 1881*.—Came here yesterday, tired, and glad to escape from London. Refreshed by the brightness of flowers and by the dear old lady, who in her 82d year is as fresh as a lark. Monday was the Dean's funeral. A marvellous spectacle. The old Abbey full from end to end : all the genius of the country—princes, peers, prelates, Cabinet ministers, and the poorest of the people of Westminster. All felt they should never see his like again. I gave the blessing on the spot from which five years ago he spoke the same words at Lady Augusta's funeral. Thursday at 9 A.M. married Montgomery² to Maud Farrar. Solemn

¹ Lady Wake's home near Northampton.

² The Rev. H. H. Montgomery, now Bishop of Tasmania.

service in Henry VII. Chapel, I taking the Dean's place close by his grave covered with wreaths. The peace of this place is restoring. There is something very solemn in being here. Thoughts of past days."

"ADDINGTON, *Sunday, August 28, 1881.*—Monday, spoke in House of Lords on Disestablishment of the Church in Ceylon. Bradley has after a long delay been appointed Dean of Westminster. I rejoice that the best of Arnoldian traditions will thus be maintained. He is a good, large-hearted, humble-minded man. Our attempt to rescue poor Mr. Green from gaol by an Act of Parliament has failed, by the machinations of the evil-disposed in the House of Commons."¹

"*Sunday, Sept. 11, 1881, ADDINGTON.*—Have read Plumptre's *Kohелеth*, a wonderful proof of the author's power of work. The week has passed as usual; letters innumerable. Hard work on Visitation returns. Wrote an important letter to Archbishop of York about Mr. Green's imprisonment. Addresses on lay helpers. To-day read Ottley's *Great Dilemma*; it sets forth the argument well. Also Jenkins's *Devotion of the Sacred Heart*. His knowledge stands us in good stead in dealing with these foolish and mischievous superstitions. I particularly admire his quotation from Athanasius on the title-page. Our house has been full of widows and orphans—four widows, two widowers, several fatherless and motherless spinsters, and a crowd of fatherless and motherless children. It has been a pleasant party none the less, even for —, who, having no connection with the family, found herself precipitated into it. It is one great use and blessing of a country house like this. We have finished *Hereward the Wake* and much enjoyed it; it opened up quite a fresh interest in a portion of history little known. A good deal of my time this week has been taken up with writing two long memoranda on Dean Stanley, stirred up to do so by a message from Grove. It seems to me very necessary that a record should remain somewhere of what I know better than any one else of his real character and the circumstances that moulded it. Also there has been so much misrepresentation of late years of the origin and progress of what is called the 'Oxford School,' that it is well some record of the real facts should be drawn up by one who remembers them. A. and I have been very leisurely reading Jowett's translation of the *Alcibiades* of Plato. I am

¹ See page 456.

wading somewhat painfully through the Bishop of Durham's defence (in the *Guardian*) of the introduction of Diabolus into the Lord's Prayer."

"*Sunday, Sept. 18th, 1881, ADDINGTON.*—On Thursday last I went to dear Wildman's¹ funeral. How much intellectually I owe to him. When I went to Renishaw during the first years of my Oxford life, I used to find him very often there. There was then in the house a famous old library collected by an old fellow of Corpus. It contained a great number of theological books, and Wildman, who was only ten years older than myself, had ever a voracious appetite for books on Classics and Divinity, with which he endeavoured to inoculate me—Middleton's *Free Enquiry*, Bentley's writings, critical and controversial, etc., etc. The other person to whom I owe most in the same direction was the Dean of Wells, with whom I read Eusebius and Socrates' *Ecclesiastical History* after I had taken my degree, and who introduced me to Warburton, etc."

"*ADDINGTON, Sunday, Sept. 25, 1881.*—Ordination candidates all this week. They seem a promising set. An excellent sermon to-day from Dale of Dartford. I have received a sudden summons from the American Committee in London to preach at the Commemoration Service of President Garfield to-morrow night in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. This has rather upset me."

"*2 October.*—On Monday evening I preached in St. Martin's to an overpowering congregation of English and Americans. Preached without book. American Minister present. Wonderful occasion. Heat and crowd too much for me."²

¹ Mr. Richard Wildman, the Archbishop's brother-in-law.

² With reference to this sermon (which, it may be mentioned, was telegraphed *in extenso* to New York), it may be appropriate to quote the following sentences from a letter which appeared in *The Times* of September 27 from the pen of an American lady:—"The sympathy of England has seemed to me to find expression in no single thing so intrinsically great as was the Archbishop of Canterbury's address to the Americans last evening gathered in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields. The mere appearance of this venerable old man was a tribute, but the words he spoke—words of noble simplicity in which appeared the majesty of human experience made temperate by sorrow and profound by love—interpreted the lesson of the hour, and paid grandly the dues of grandeur. These are the immortelles which the Church of England's Primate has laid on the grave of our first citizen at Mentor. I thank him from my heart, for myself and all my country-people, for I am certain there is no American in England who would not gladly subscribe to the sentiments I have tried to express in this letter."

"STONEHOUSE, *Sunday, Nov. 6th, 1881.*—This week quiet at Addington till Wednesday. On that day preached at opening of Wilmington Church. A long day's work. Back in time to receive the Old Catholic Bishops, Herzog and Reinkens; also Fremantle, Archdeacon Watkins, and Sir Walter James. Much interesting conversation. Reinkens spoke only German; Herzog, good English. Their work is evidently slow and difficult. Humanly speaking, it seems impossible that these two can stand up against the Pope and all his influence, and yet keep themselves separate from the Protestants. Bismarck is personally kind to Reinkens, but makes no sign of help. 'He would help us fast enough if we had two million followers.' Speaking of Bismarck, he said that when you shook hands with him you felt that his hand was the largest that had ever been seen."

"ADDINGTON, *Sunday, December 11, 1881.*—Returned here on Monday. A busy week since then; four days of Cathedral Commission with incessant work. On Thursday I had to add to the Cathedral Commission, (1) the Ecclesiastical Commission, (2) an interview at the Home Office with the Home Secretary on City Churches, (3) an important meeting of the Governing Body of Charterhouse, in all of which much depended on my action. Yesterday, a day of snow, was quiet except for harassing Diocesan business. Prepared sermon. Read *Phado* with L. and A."

"*Christmas Day, 1881, ADDINGTON.*—This certainly has not been a very bright, but I think a useful, time. On my birthday and other days this week have spent most of my time in bed, coughing very much. Have been unable to attend meetings, but have done some work from bed. I felt very poorly and low. What a cheer are my three girls, watching me by day and night. Carols last night at 2 A.M. Henry indefatigable with the parishioners: an invaluable pastor. To-day, Holy Communion in the Chapel. Have been reading in *John Inglesant* the election of Pope Cardinal Chigi. Have now read much of the book. Dull, if a novel; wanting the substratum of truth to make a good memoir. Many kind Xmas cards and messages. I am now 70."

"*Sunday, Jan. 1st, 1882, ADDINGTON.*—Slowly recovering after a fortnight in the house. Holy Communion to-day in the Chapel. Read Trench's Charge to his Clergy. Not the slightest allusion to the disturbed state of Ireland. Is this a proof that Churches unestablished altogether separate the religious from the social and

political life of the community? Or was it that he could not even trust himself to allude to it? Have finished *Phædo*, and have tried Grote on Socrates, but made more progress with *John Inglesant*."

"*Sunday, Jan. 8, 1882, ADDINGTON.*—Decidedly better, but very weak. Pleasant visit from Bishop of Manchester, Tom Hughes, Goldwin Smith, etc. Long talk with Bishop of Manchester about his Green difficulties. I am perpetually receiving appeals urging me to interfere. Goldwin Smith poured abundantly and was very interesting on all subjects. To-day I have been reading Neander's account of Arianism and the Nicene Creed; Stanley's ditto; and a sermon of Illingworth's on Faith, which impressed me a good deal."

"*Sunday, Jan. 15, 1882, ADDINGTON.*—Business has occupied me many hours a day. 'My Novel' has become rather tedious, like everything else. There are few things in which one does not feel disposed to say after a time, 'There, that will do, sir,' in the words of the old Master of Balliol. Have been trying what can be done to bring the combatants over Mr. Green's body and Mr. Green himself to reason, but without much appearance of success at present."¹

"*January 29th, 1882, ADDINGTON.*—Courtenay Knollys here this week; talk about Barbados. Not an easy thing to find a suitable Bishop, and I have much anxious thought about it. Also distressed to hear that —, whom we had chosen for Bishop of Sierra Leone, breaks down in health. A very special man for sense, goodness, and vigour, is needed. I rejoice that C.M.S. has shown a disposition to clear away difficulties as to a Bishop for Japan. Here also a special man is needed, and the choice rests in my hands. Besides this there is a delegation to myself, with York and London, to appoint a Bishop for the new Diocese of Riverina. Surely there falls on this See the care of all the Churches. God give me grace!"

"*LAMBETH, Sexagesima, February 12, 1882.*—Very busy since Tuesday. Opening of Parliament. Debate heavy; only relieved by Duke of Somerset, who, amongst other things, told us he had been fifty years in Parliament, and that every year they had been informed by the Government of the day that Ireland was

¹ See pages 456-463.

improving. He supposed therefore it had now reached what Government officials considered a state of absolute perfection."

"*February 26th, 1882, LAMBETH.*—To-day I have preached at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields to 500 postmen who form the St. Martin's League.¹ Stanton deserves immense credit for getting together these young men. Sad that there should be such quarrels in the Church, and that men like Stanton should be mixed up with them. I was much struck on Friday by the account given of Mr. Green's work among his congregation, by one of their number who accompanied the Churchwardens to our Commission, and who traced all his religious impressions to Mr. Green's teaching. . . . Why Green was singled out for prosecution remains a mystery. He is evidently much beloved by his congregation. I trust by God's blessing we may be able to pour some oil on these troubled waters. Much might be done, I think, by personal kindness."

"*LAMBETH, Sunday, March 12, 1882.*—Now I am ordered off to the Riviera—Gull commands. I trust I may gain strength from the sunshine, but it must be doubtful. Lord, watch over us and bless this rest, and bring us back refreshed and strengthened, if it be Thy will. Seventy years are a heavy burden. The Lord bless old age and its trials and its tranquil thoughts. Amen."

"*TERRES BLANCHES, PÉGOMAS,² Palm Sunday, April 2.*—Thank God for the rest of this place. I find people in England think I am going to resign. I don't know that I am. To-day have been to Holy Communion at Ch. Ch., Cannes. We have made the acquaintance of the curés of Auribeaux and Pégomas, the latter a striking man, very poor, but with remarkable face and very polished manners. The house of each is a mere cottage. Churches nicely kept, but decorations in execrable taste. The two men were in despair as to the irreligious state of France. Many parishes represented as having no pastor from the failure of candidates. Their account of their ruri-decanal meetings most curious."

"*April 13th.*—Lucy and I visited another curé at his house: a funny little deaf old man, always laughing, and apparently a very broad churchman. He did not seem afraid of 'ces mes-

¹ See pp. 483-485.

² A retired villa on the hills between Cannes and Grasse, which was lent to the Archbishop for a few weeks.

sieurs à Paris.' Another curé from the mountains visited us to-day, a sturdy young man accompanied by his father, a very clean agreeable old peasant. I gather that all these men read *L'Univers*, and form the worst conceivable opinions of the present Government. I am reading Balzac, who gives a very bad account of the spirit of the peasantry forty years ago. Have also read Dr. Bonar's accounts of the Protestant Missions in Paris and Lyons—written with a rosy pen. Also George MacDonald's *Paul Faber*. Have begun with A. the *Odyssey* in Collins' Little Classics. Lady Verney's most interesting article on peasant proprietors in France is a melancholy picture, if correct."

"AVIGNON, *April 21*.—Clear statement from a very intelligent old man as to the puzzling subject, now exercising France, of Scrutin de Liste et Scrutin d'Arrondissement. He is of opinion that the Radicals already find they have carried matters with too high a hand, and that a reaction is imminent. . . . At Nîmes, where there are 18,000 voters, there were at Easter 9000 male communicants. People are driven to the necessity of more distinctly expressing their opinions on religious subjects."

"PARIS, 23 *April 1882*.—M. Bersier, whom I yesterday visited, took an entirely different view of the Education question from three out of the four curés with whom we conversed about it at Pégomas. He believes religion can be more effectually taught under the new than under the old system. . . . Called yesterday on Père Hyacinthe, and had much important conversation about the prospects of his work. . . ."

"LAMBETH, *April 30, 1882*.—Thank God we are home again, safe and well. So much has happened this week that I can scarcely believe we were in Paris last Sunday. Miserable crossing to Folkestone on Monday. Thence to Addington. Hosts of letters. Drove to Lambeth Wednesday. Spoke at Bishop of London's Fund meeting. Reached Windsor Castle at 6. Enormous party of household and guests. . . . [A full account of the Duke of Albany's wedding follows.] After the wedding three hours of letters with Ellison. Grand Royal banquet at night. Friday, all the Royalties again at Marlborough House. Royal Academy dinner on Saturday. Granville's the only really good speech."

"LAMBETH, *Sunday, May 7th*.—Intense excitement this week respecting Ireland, ending in the horrible news this morning that

the Government's new departure in policy, notwithstanding Forster's protest and resignation, has been inaugurated by the murder of Lord F. Cavendish and Mr. Burke in open day in Phoenix Park. Wretched Ireland, long misgoverned, never more so during this century than now. Great meeting of Bishops on Tuesday to consider plans for releasing Mr. Green by legislation.¹ Very busy all the week with R. Commissions, etc., besides letters innumerable."

"MARDEN, *Whitsunday, May 28th, 1882.*—A fearfully busy week. *Monday*, preached at opening of Church at Norwood. House of Lords in evening. Two Bills. *Tuesday*, Bishops' meeting and dinner at Lambeth. Thirty-two present. *Wednesday*, Heard Judicial Appeal from Lichfield Diocese. Then Cathedral Commission. Then Church Building Society. Spoke. *Thursday*, Ecclesiastical Commission. Then Eccl. Courts Commission till past 6. *Friday*, Many interviews. Then Ecclesiastical Courts Commission. Queen's Concert at night. *Saturday*, Came here. Still reading *The Chaplain of the Fleet*: not fit for any heavier reading. To-day preached here on 'The River of the Water of Life.'² Holy Communion. I am quite tired out. Lucy is going to read to me Guizot's *Calvin*."

"LAMBETH, *June 11, 1882.*—Left Stonehouse on Tuesday, rather shaken by a fall, the consequences of which have developed themselves since. Contumacy Bill in House of Lords that night. *Thursday*, Ecclesiastical Commission. A nervous attack at luncheon, which kept me quiet for the next two days. Finished *The American Irish*. Began George MacDonald's *Castle Warlock*. Have begun with A. to read Plato's *Republic* and some of Niebuhr's *Lectures on Greek History*. Still very weak and not up to much. Much depressed by the miserable condition of Ireland, and indeed of English Government generally."

"ADDINGTON, *Sunday, July 2, 1882.*—A busy week. On Friday Carpenter and Gull overhauled me. The heart, they say, is too weak, and great care is required to guard against over-fatigue. People agree persistently that for the man and for the office it would be wrong to resign: that what is wanted is to confine the work to what is absolutely necessary, and to avoid overtaxing the

¹ See p. 468.

² Though he gave a few occasional addresses in the months that followed, this was the last sermon the Archbishop ever preached.

physical strength. The doctors think I shall be better here during the summer than anywhere else, if I can only keep pressing business at a distance. Holy Communion in church to-day. I was much impressed with Henry's plain sermon."

"LAMBETH, *Sunday, July 9th*.—Back from Addington in time for all the letters and business. *Tuesday*, Cathedral Commission. Spoke in House of Lords on Duke of Argyll's Oath Bill.¹ *Wednesday*, Cathedral Commission and Orphanage Service and garden party. *Thursday*, Church Defence Institution. Spoke. Ecclesiastical Courts Commission. *Friday*, Courts Commission and much business. *Saturday*, Comparative rest, but interviews—interviews. So week passes after week, and I feel more and more the burden of age."

"LAMBETH, *23d July*.—Now we have come to the last Sunday of another London session. I am still alive, but very shaky, and shall be glad to get out of London air and work. What with continual Commissions and other business, I am clean worked out. Sleeplessness at night, sickness, nervous affection, but mercifully the clearness of my head and power of speech are not affected. I can scarcely walk above a very short way, but thank God I can drive in the fresh air. Dear Chattie² is still with us here—thirteen years older than me, and as fresh as a lark, but I doubt if she could make as good speeches. Public affairs in Egypt are most distressing."

"FULHAM PALACE, *July 30th, 1882*.—We are spending a quiet Sunday here with the Bishop of London. So ends this session. It must be very doubtful whether Lambeth will another year be a centre for the same friends."

"ADDINGTON, *August 6th, 1882*.—From Monday to Thursday we were at Selsdon, where the Bishop of Rochester most hospitably received us. On Thursday settled here, glad indeed to be quietly at home. I cannot much enjoy the country, feeling so very unwell, but everything is looking lovely. By A.'s help, I have written out a Charge for the young Princes' Confirmation.³ I shall be truly thankful when this very important visit to

¹ This was his last speech in the House of Lords. See p. 585.

² Lady Wake.

³ It had been arranged that Prince Albert Victor and Prince George of Wales should be confirmed at Osborne early in August.

Osborne is over. I have been reading *God and the Man*, by Buchanan, a powerful novel, and dipping into Froude's *Carlyle*."

"ADDINGTON, *Sunday, August 13th, 1882.*—To Osborne on Monday. Bank holiday. Crossed on the *Alberta*. Next day, examination of the Princes. . . . Confirmation at Whippingham at 4 o'clock. All the officers of the *Bacchante*, and many blue-jackets. The Queen received all the officers afterwards. . . . Nothing could be more prosperous, thank God, than the whole visit, and the Queen's personal kindness. . . . A long and hot journey home. Thank God I have got so well through this somewhat difficult task. The Charge has gone to the printers to be prepared for private circulation. We are now reading Froude's *Carlyle*, and at night the *Bride of Lammermoor*, and to-day Stanley's *Posthumous Sermons*."

"ADDINGTON, *August 20th, 1882.*—The account of this week is that I have been in bed every day . . . but I have not been idle. I have despatched many letters of great importance, including one to Mr. Gladstone on the termination of Green's imprisonment;¹ and directions to all concerned respecting a new Bishop for Jerusalem. I have also prepared for Macmillan a longish article on Mozley's *Reminiscences of the Oxford School*. I hope it may please God to soothe the inevitable concomitants of the swiftly approaching change. I have been thinking to-day of the deaths of all my intimate friends. Few have passed through it without long and painful struggle. It is well there is One who invites us to cast all our care upon Him."

Thus ends his *Diary*, if such it can be called: a diary written or dictated with almost unbroken perseverance and regularity during his twenty-six years' Episcopate. The brief record of his remaining months of failing strength and patient waiting, surrounded by those whom he loved best on earth, must be told a little later, in words other than his own.

¹ See p. 470.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

REMINISCENCES OF HIS LAST YEARS.

THE MANNER OF HIS WORK—THE NEARING OF THE END—
THE LAST ILLNESS—THE CALL HOME.

1877-1882.

AN attempt has been made in this volume to depict or explain the Archbishop's line of action in the various controversies which, during the last decade of his life, were dividing and even distracting the Church of England. If the story has been told with any measure of success, his position, not official only, but personal, as one of the foremost public men in England, must have been made clear. Carefully as he abstained from interference in mere party politics, it is scarcely too much to say that on few public questions of the larger sort did people feel that the last word had been spoken until the Archbishop had been heard. Other men, lay or ecclesiastic, might strike harder blows than he, or raise a louder cry on behalf of the cause for which they cared, but there in the background was the Archbishop, a personality to be neither forgotten nor ignored, an inevitable factor in the ultimate solution of every question affecting the moral and religious welfare of the nation, whether at home or beyond the sea.

And yet to those who knew him best, his eminence as a Christian statesman seems to rest even more securely upon his power of dealing with the common round of each day's work than on the larger and more conspicuous efforts

which could be seen by all the world. It is easy to make this statement in general terms ; it is not easy to give it point. Routine work is the most difficult of all things to describe. To dwell upon minute details may even defeat the primary object of a biography, namely to set the central figure before ordinary readers in clearest and most effective outline. In drawing such a picture it is always possible, as has been well said,¹ to bury the man himself in the details of his work, and to tell all that he did at the cost of obscuring much of what he was. But difficult as it is to describe the personal side of such work, the task ought not to be impossible, and it will perhaps be best accomplished if I² endeavour to set down, as simply as I can, some reminiscences of the life at Lambeth and Addington which it was my privilege for six busy years to share, illustrating and expanding these reminiscences when necessary by a reference to such correspondence as has been preserved.

I was appointed Resident Chaplain and Private Secretary to the Archbishop in April 1877, and a few weeks afterwards I entered on the work—and very hard work it was—which he required of his Chaplain-Secretary. For ten years previously—in fact ever since my school-days,—the Archbishop had shown me frequent acts of kindness.³ Craufurd Tait and I had cemented an Oxford friendship by a long tent-journey together in the East in 1872-73. We were ordained side by side on March 1st, 1874, and though our curacies were in opposite corners of the Canterbury Diocese, we continued to see much of one another, and I was frequently a guest at Lambeth and Addington. It was not therefore a great surprise to me

¹ See Bosworth Smith's *Life of Lord Lawrence*, vol. i. p. 391.

² R. T. D.

³ My father and he had been school-fellows fifty years before, and had maintained a friendship ever since.

that when Craufurd, who had been acting for a year as his father's confidential chaplain, resolved to give up the post, the Archbishop invited me to take his place.

From my intimacy with Craufurd I knew something of the duties, and I had already begun to feel for the Archbishop the reverent affection which was to increase (in a measure I had not myself expected) with every month of his remaining years. A few weeks after I had begun my work Craufurd started somewhat suddenly on a visit to America, and as there was in those days no second chaplain in the house, there was left upon my shoulders the full burden of a work the extent and gravity of which I was only beginning to understand. I can never forget the courteous consideration and kindness with which the Archbishop helped and guided me in those early days, when I must have been blundering even more than I knew.

Intimate as the relation must necessarily be between private secretaries and their chiefs, I doubt whether in English public life any parallel could be found to the complete and unreserved confidence which Archbishop Tait used—quite deliberately—to repose in the man, whoever he might be, whom he had chosen for the time to be his chaplain, his amanuensis, and—no other word is possible—his critic. In the high offices of political life, the joint responsibility, and therefore the mutual confidences, say of colleagues in a Cabinet, necessitate, I am told, a somewhat sterner rule of reticence; and there is an area—sometimes a large one—into which even the private secretary cannot penetrate. An Archbishop is, for the most part, under no such restriction. In the case of individuals, whether clergy or laity, who come to him or write to him on private matters, there is of course as sure a seal of secrecy as could attach to the Confessional itself, but at that point, in Archbishop Tait's view, the restriction

ended ; and in everything which concerned his public or official action, however confidential its plan, however personal its application, he not only permitted but peremptorily required on the part of his chaplain-secretary the fullest knowledge and the most frank criticism.

I remember my bewilderment when one afternoon, a few days after I had left my curacy and settled at Lambeth, he rebuked me seriously for a temporary absence which had prevented him, he said, from despatching an urgent and important letter because I had not seen it. Seeing my surprise, he added, "I have been more than twenty years a Bishop, and I have never, if I could help it, written a single letter of importance without giving it to somebody to pick holes in ; and the silliest people," he continued with a twinkle, "are often the best critics. So take that draft and let me know in half an hour what you think about it." This invariable wish for the help of a second pair of eyes was specially noteworthy in combination with the marked self-reliance and independence of judgment which characterised every stage of his public life. It was a precaution, but no more. He was the last man in England who could be accused of being led by his subordinates, or of chattering about his correspondence. Mrs. Tait used sometimes to complain that she knew nothing of his public policy or utterances till she read them in the newspapers. Careful as he was that his chosen aide-de-camp should know all the facts and speak his mind, it had perhaps no great influence upon the main decision. The criticism was valued at its proper worth, or worthlessness, and no more. His resolves were emphatically his own, and he used to speak them out with a deliberate bluntness, and then leave them to be brought back for his inspection when they had passed through what he called the chaplain's turning-lathe. As years

advanced he grew less and less inclined either to read letters himself or to write the answers. With a few necessary exceptions every letter was read to him; every answer was dictated, partly because of an increasing weakness or stiffness in his fingers, partly because of the better opportunities which dictation gave for a running criticism upon his words, partly because he could work best when walking about the room or garden. He was always in the open air when possible, and many of the most important and careful letters I can remember had to be scribbled as best they might while we paced up and down the gravel walks at Lambeth or the little footpath along the Broadstairs cliffs. His scribe used to be reduced to sore straits on a windy day, and we came to the last straw when he insisted on my revising and annotating a series of Visitation statistics upon sheets of flimsy foolscap while riding with him on horseback along the Thames Embankment. After the sorrows of 1878, when he became almost suddenly an old man, he took to dictating to me the letters of supreme importance only, and contented himself with briefest directions for the rest. But no letter, unless purely formal, was allowed to leave the house till he had seen, or rather heard, it. The "sacred principle of delegation," as he called it, became with him a fine art, and he applied it with a success to which I have known no parallel; rarely writing a letter himself, and yet retaining even in small matters a control and recollection which frequently surprised us all. He had of course special advantages in the unimpaired possession, up to the end of his life, of a memory which seemed to come at call, enabling him after a few moments' thought to reproduce even the insignificant particulars of some former correspondence, however local, or petty, or personal. Again and again, on hearing a letter read, he would startle his

secretary by some resuscitation of a long-forgotten fact, or a reference to some casual remark in the correspondence of previous years: "Stop a moment. Is this the same lady who applied a few years ago for a subscription for a new church bell? I think she was the churchwarden's wife"; or "What does he say is the population of the new streets? In the last Visitation returns he called it 400, not 350"; or "I can't help thinking Bishop Wilberforce once wrote to me about that man. It must have been when I was Bishop of London. Look it up before you send the answer. I rather think he has a stammer." And all this without confusion or worry, passing straight on from one subject to another as quickly as the pencil docket could be made. He insisted, even when letter-baskets were heaviest, on our going right ahead through each day's work, taking big and little things just as they came. "Never disturb the providential strata: take them as they lie: we shall come to the big things in their proper turn." On days of special pressure one had to circumvent this often unworkable rule by a little management beforehand; but he always professed to disapprove. "Now, then, you've been tampering with the strata again. Why don't you stick to the rule?"

During the six years I was with him the correspondence increased almost by a fourth, and additional chaplain help became necessary. I find that in 1880 our daily average of letters posted was about forty-seven during the summer months, and thirty-six during the winter, independently of all those despatched through the office of the Legal Secretary.¹ There are, of course, many men

¹ George Lipscomb, porter at Lambeth for 42 years, and now Warden of the Whitgift Hospital at Croydon, is able to give a curious picture of the contrast in postal matters between his earliest and his latest years. "In Archbishop Howley's days," he writes, "the General Postman, dressed in bright scarlet, brought the country letters every morning, and came round again at five o'clock in the evening to collect the letters. He went to the

in public and commercial life whose daily letters are more numerous than those of an Archbishop; but I doubt if there is any great office in the kingdom in which the proportion of merely routine letters is so small as it is at Lambeth, or the subjects so varied, or the need of the chief's own care so incessant. For the last twenty years the Primate has been happily relieved by a Bishop Suffragan from much of the ordinary Diocesan correspondence about Confirmations and the like, and many hundreds of his other letters go direct to the Legal Secretary's office. Certainly less than one-third of Archbishop Tait's correspondence belonged to the Diocese of Canterbury. It was essentially Archiepiscopal rather than Diocesan, and no small proportion of it came across the sea. Every year of his Primacy, it is true, had seen an increase in the independence and the autonomy of the Colonial and Missionary Churches. But with the weakening of their official link with Canterbury there came, it would seem, an even increasing demand for counsel and guidance of an unofficial kind; nor is there anything to justify a forecast that the perplexities, the disputes, and the necessities of Colonial Churchmen will cease to find their way into the Lambeth letter-box. To few parts of his work did Archbishop Tait attach more importance or devote more time than he did to some of these Colonial and Missionary controversies. The minute-books of the larger Church societies bear ample evidence of this ungrudging care, and the Dioceses—to take a few examples—of Jamaica, Madagascar, Dunedin, Colombo, Mauritius, and Capetown front door, ringing in his hands a heavy bell to give notice of his coming. He had a guinea a quarter from the Palace. The general-post letters in the morning for the Archbishop and Mrs. Howley were put into a china bowl in the hall. There were scarcely enough to cover the bottom of it. When the Archbishop was at Addington, and I had to forward the letters there, I could put as a rule all the letters of the day, servants' included, in a medium-sized envelope."

must have formidable packets of his letters among their archives.

Quite apart, however, from his correspondence upon what may be called the "unofficial *business*" of such dioceses, the Archbishop, as years went on, became more and more the personal and private referee for every sort of difficulty arising in the Colonial Church. Take, as a single specimen, such a matter as the following, selected almost at haphazard, but worth recording for its intrinsic interest. A Colonial Bishop wrote to him as follows:—

"I want your advice and direction about what may at first, I fancy, raise a smile when you read my difficulty, but which is such terribly sober earnest to the person concerned, that I hope you will give it your consideration, and favour me with a reply directing me how to act.

"Early this year an estimable clergyman in my Diocese, the Rev. A. B., . . . became disordered in mind, and was obliged to give up his curacy. After some aberrations, the malady suddenly took the terrible form of the conviction that he was possessed by a devil. At first he was terribly violent and destructive in his paroxysms. . . . It was a very terrible sight. He certainly exhibited all the phenomena of demoniacal possession which we read of in the Gospels—the same tendency to tear off clothes, the constant grinding of the teeth, and distressing working of the maxillary muscles; above all the strange duality of consciousness, with a constant struggle between the two wills—even a duality of vocalisation, Mr. B. from time to time talking in his natural voice, and then suddenly (and often with blasphemous expressions utterly alien to his natural disposition) in a totally different voice, and a totally changed expression of countenance. Since then I have frequently visited him, and I notice that he is quieter than heretofore, and less liable to demoniacal outbreaks. Oddly enough, except for this 'possession,' he is as rational as you or I. The memory is entire; his powers of reasoning clear and vigorous, and his hold upon the doctrines and duties of religion, strong and persistent, in spite of rude interruptions during prayer, and at the mention of holy persons and things, from his devil-half. He is painfully conscious of this, and, on his complaining that the devil

would not let him think consecutively in unpremeditated prayer, I composed for him some forms of private prayer suitable to his case. But from my first visit he has constantly implored me to exorcise him, declaring that he is satisfied that he must be thus authoritatively exorcised to be relieved, and trying to prove to me that I have the power to set him free. I have reasoned much with him (for he is quite capable of argument), to show him that I see no evidence that this extraordinary gift was continued to Christ's Ministry along with the ordinary gifts of the Spirit, and we have thoroughly discussed the question together. I have tried to make him believe that in answer to united and persistent prayer the relief will be granted in Christ's time in Christ's way; but he still has set his heart on exorcism, and I have promised to refer the question to you, and to abide by your dictum in the matter. Will you kindly direct me as to what I ought to do?"

The Archbishop replied :—

"MY DEAR BISHOP,—I am in receipt of your interesting letter. What you tell me about Mr. B. is very remarkable.

"Under all the circumstances I cannot think you would do wrong in yielding to his desire for a formal service of the nature of Exorcism. Of course such words as you would use would all be in the form of prayer, and if he desires that you should in a set form of words call upon God in prayer to deliver him in His mercy from this terrible seizure or disease, there can, I think, be no reason against your doing so. From what you say of the poor man's present state, he is evidently quite capable of understanding the nature of such a service, which he would not suppose to be an exercise of miraculous power on your part, but an invocation of the aid of Almighty God to bring his suffering to an end. So long as he understands that the operative power is God's and not man's, he may call it Exorcism if he will; and it would seem hardly right to deny him—in his present distressing condition—the special form of relief which he craves.

"Such at least is my view of the matter which you have laid before me. I shall be much interested to hear the issue.¹—Yours ever,

A. C. CANTUAR."

In estimating the relative importance of the various

¹ The Bishop acted in accordance with the advice thus given. Recovery ensued.

departments of his public work, the Archbishop, as it seems to me, kept constantly in the forefront his religious responsibilities towards the nation as a whole, remitting, perhaps unconsciously, to a second place all that concerned the internal administration of the Church's own life and affairs, and to a third place the more defined and immediate duties which devolved upon him as Bishop of the Diocese of Canterbury. He never ceased to remind his own Diocesan clergy of these larger departments of his work: and, easy as it was for ecclesiastical critics to say and write hard things about "the Archbishop of the laity," his own view of his duties was so clear and unwavering that I do not believe these particular criticisms gave him so much as a moment's uneasiness. No small part of the weightiness of his speeches was due, I think, to the wide and unprofessional basis of his knowledge about public affairs. In the account given of his earlier years reference has been made to his lifelong interest in the affairs of countries other than our own. It may safely be said that not one English clergyman in 500 concerns himself with the politics of France and Germany, and I have again and again been asked after breakfast by some visitor at Lambeth how it came about that the Archbishop always listened first to the newspaper articles which dealt with any fresh development of public affairs upon the Continent. It was his almost invariable custom to have the newspapers read aloud at breakfast by one of the family, and, generally speaking, he would not allow these occasions to be used for reading articles or speeches about the Church—least of all for reports or criticisms of what he had himself been saying. Politics, in the widest sense of the term—public affairs at home and abroad—these were what specially interested him out of "business hours." Later in the day, perhaps when driving to

meetings or travelling by rail, or when the morning's letters had been grappled with, he would give his full attention to Church news. But, unless at some moment of extraordinary interest, this never came first; and for the same reason he was at no time a close student of Church newspapers. He expected, however, to be kept abreast of them by others, and enjoined upon us Chaplains to overlook no number either of the *Church Times* or the *Record*, and to paste into the huge newspaper extract-books every article of special interest.

In the earlier years of his Episcopate he had evinced this interest in public affairs by going far more frequently than any other Bishop to the Peers' Gallery of the House of Commons, but he had almost given this up before my Chaplain-life began. From the House of Lords he was scarcely ever absent when anything was going on. Other engagements had to give way to this, and he used half-comically to ascribe his extraordinary influence there to the fact of his regular attendance—"A man can't sit here every night for a quarter-of-a-century without people wanting to know what he comes for and listening to what he has got to say." Other evidence is easily forthcoming as to the causes and character of the influence he exercised in the debates of the gilded chamber; but the indirect consequences of his being always on the spot are themselves worth noticing. The Archbishop's robing-room became known to public men of every sort who wanted to consult him, and I can recall almost as many interviews of first-rate importance in that room as either at Lambeth or Addington, while it possessed the additional advantage that, if need required, he could escape at a moment's notice into the House itself, and leave his Chaplain to be buttonholed instead. There were certainly scores of cases in which he was able

to talk things over with Parliamentary opponents or malcontents who would never have gone to Lambeth to consult him. It was to him a constant source of regret for the Church's sake that other Bishops made so little of their Parliamentary opportunities. He felt it especially with regard to Bishop Fraser, and I remember particularly an interview between the two, in the central lobby, on one of the very rare occasions when Bishop Fraser was at Westminster. "If I could only get you to believe," he said, "that the House of Lords is a bigger thing than even the *Manchester Guardian*, and that you might be speaking to the Empire instead of to a county."

I have always wished that I could have known him in his younger and more active days. And yet I believe the last decade of his life was in some respects the best. His remarkable power of work was shown, not in the number of his daily working hours, but in the multitude of things he compassed in a morning or an afternoon, and the use he made of every moment in the carriage or elsewhere. He had never at any period of his life attempted to rival the ubiquity or versatility of Bishop Wilberforce, but he shared with him the power of passing, without fussiness or strain, from one engagement to another, and of utilising for the dictation of important letters even the smallest interstices of time. No picture of him would be complete which did not mark this absence of fussiness as one of his peculiar characteristics. It was the rarest possible thing to see him in a hurry about anything. Addington is four miles from the railway station. He used always to dictate letters on the way, and would irritate his good old coachman beyond endurance, when every effort had been expended to catch a train, by calmly sitting still in the carriage to complete a paragraph when the bell had rung and the train was on the very point of starting.

This total absence of fuss and flurry used to deceive his guests in the oddest way. I remember an American Ecclesiastic, who was staying at Lambeth at a very busy time, asking me, on the second or third morning, if the Archbishop was holiday-making, as he seemed to have nothing particular to do, and was constantly walking in the garden. We, on whom the actual writing devolved, used to complain that he was utterly reckless about the time or engagements of his subordinates, and would keep us waiting in the most provoking manner on the chance of a spare three minutes for some signatures or directions, rather than hurry his movements in the least degree or cut a conversation short.

The doctor who knew him best has ascribed to this steady calmness of manner and movement the fact that he was able to resist so long the dangers attaching to an enfeebled heart; but it would be a mistake to suppose that his manner was deliberately adopted with that purpose. Rather it was a half-unconscious protest against the excited restlessness and fuss so familiar in modern clerical circles, which, to the pain and annoyance of some of his friends, he used to denounce as a spurious imitation or caricature of Bishop Wilberforce's untiring energy. I believe it to have been Archbishop Tait who first used the phrase, lately ascribed to another, that "the modern ideal of a Bishop is of a man in a chronic state of perspiration." It was a danger against which he almost always warned his ordination candidates, and the warning came appropriately from a man who, whatever his other faults, could never, from his boyhood upwards, be accused of any lack of industry.

It may be well, perhaps, to look at some departments of his work in more detail. To return first to his letters. He was never much of a letter-writer, as that word is

commonly used. Compared with Arnold, or Stanley, or Maurice, with Bishop Fraser or Bishop Wilberforce, with Keble or Pusey, he has left behind him no private letters at all. If the reader of this biography has anticipated that before its close he will gain some better insight into the man by a selection from his private and personal correspondence, he is, I fear, doomed to disappointment. In his later years, he wrote so little with his own hand, that such private outpourings are not to be expected. But, indeed, it seems never to have been otherwise. From his school-days onwards, the letters of his friends are full of reproaches for the meagreness and rarity of his replies. His diaries, such as they are, make up for this in some small—very small—measure ; but he had no gift or liking for detailed analysis of character, or for scenic description, or for the expression of abstract opinion upon current events or persons. His letters are almost all of the sort that this book has already exhibited in plenty—dealing practically with the actual business of the hour. There is one exception to this. The letters of sympathy he wrote to those in sorrow—short as they usually are—would form a bulky volume. From the veritable furnace of affliction through which he had to pass, not once or twice, he came forth with an earnest desire, as well as an exceptional right, to hold out the hand of fellowship to others in bereavement or distress, and scarcely a day passed, even at the busiest times, when he did not send out here and there a little line of brotherly sympathy or fatherly benediction, to those who were tasting the cup of sorrow which he had known. With this marked exception, he has left behind him scarcely any letters, even to his wife and children, outside the actual channel of his work. And yet there was always a personal character about those everyday business letters, on which so many hours of the week

were spent. I can hardly claim to have an impartial or disinterested opinion on the subject, but it seems to me that his letters, like his speeches, had a singular straightforwardness, simplicity, and strength. He said exactly what he meant, but he said it with a courtesy which does not always accompany straightforwardness and simplicity of style. At times he would come down like a sledgehammer upon a man he wished to rebuke, but it was usually for something which he regarded as base or underhand. A well-known clergyman of high standing who, in the course of a business controversy, had dragged in some very grave aspersions upon the character of a neighbouring vicar with whom he was at variance, received the following reply :—

“DEAR MR. —, —I cannot receive your letter of the — inst., vilifying a brother clergyman in terms which, had your letter not been marked ‘private,’ would certainly have been libellous, without expressing my deep regret that you should allow such licence to your pen.”

The letter went on to urge that such charges ought, if true, to be substantiated. When this course was declined, the Archbishop wrote :—

“After carefully reading what you now say, I am of opinion that it is very much to be regretted that you allow yourself to write of a brother clergyman, even in a confidential letter, in terms so unbecoming to a Christian minister. You cannot, I am sure, be aware of the impression, as to your own tone of feeling, which your remarks about — must leave on any unprejudiced person who might receive from you such a letter. Since you wish your letter to remain private, it shall certainly not go further, and I earnestly trust that the tone of mind in which it appeared to me to be written is not really yours.”

To one who had been a clergyman of the Church of England and who sent him some sermons, preached from a very different standpoint, he wrote as follows :—

“ADDINGTON PARK, CROYDON,
Jany. 4, 1881.

“MY DEAR SIR,—I ought before now to have acknowledged your courtesy in sending me your sermons called forth by my recent Charge. There is nothing that I can complain of in your remarks on myself or my words ; but I should not be honest if I did not say how shocked I was by your remarks on the character and history of Our Lord. I can scarcely conceive that you will gravely maintain that His teaching as to His place in relation to the Father, is to be accounted for by His diseased state of brain having led Him to utter what was blasphemy. Yet this I understand to be your statement ; and you do not see that independently of the revolting nature of such a statement, it involves the gross logical fallacy of *petitio principii*, for you would yourself, I think, grant that there is not the slightest warrant for such a supposition, except from your taking it for granted that the whole Christian scheme for which St. Paul and the other early teachers suffered so much is incredible and blasphemous—the very point which you profess to be endeavouring to prove, while you quietly take it for granted.

“I cannot give up the hope that you will return to the faith you have thrown off. With the hope that some such blessing may come upon you this New Year, I am, very faithfully yours,
“A. C. CANTUAR.”

It used to seem to me at the time, mistakenly as I now think, that he was almost too willing to reply to every casual correspondent who wanted an answer on some simple point of theology or criticism, which might have been obtained without difficulty from his parish priest. Such letters, for example, as the following, are not usually supposed to form a necessary part of an Archbishop's daily correspondence :—

“YOUR GRACE,—I am a journeyman hatter, and of necessity am constantly among a number of working men in a shop, and arguments are of frequent occurrence. The last was upon the Holy Scriptures . . . [It was maintained by those whom I tried to answer] that the present Bible was not to be depended on, as the

translators had so altered and transposed it from the original Hebrew as to leave it unreliable."

The Archbishop replied the same evening :—

"DEAR SIR,—Our Authorised Version of the Holy Scriptures contains a translation of the original which, agreeing with other translations, is acknowledged by all competent judges to be in essential points an accurate representation of the meaning of the original books.

"You are aware that the books of the New Testament, as we at present possess them in the original Greek, are quoted by a succession of writers up to the age of the Apostles. Modern attempts to discredit this are utter failures. You are therefore certainly in the right when you assert to the objectors whom you have met with that the Gospel, as we now have it, is the undoubted Gospel of Our Lord and His Apostles, and the proof of the genuineness and authority of the New Testament implies the truth of the Old.—Your faithful servant, A. C. CANTUAR."

Or again :—

"May it please your Grace,—As an anxious layman I wish to know, on the highest Episcopal authority, whether in Holy Baptism we are born again, *i.e.* Regenerate. Secondly, whether we do or do not receive in the Holy Eucharist, the 'Body and Blood,' as taught in our Catechism. Thirdly, whether it is really necessary to go to Confession before receiving it. . . . An earnest soul cannot build its faith on every 'wind of doctrine,' and I trust therefore your Grace will pardon me for asking a clear definition from the highest authority."

The Archbishop replied :—

"MY DEAR SIR,— . . . In the services for the ministration of Baptism and the Book of Common Prayer you will find, alike for Infants and Adults, the word 'regenerate' applied to the baptized immediately after the actual Baptism has been ministered. In Article XXVII. you will find an exposition which may help you to the right understanding of the word 'regenerate,' which has caused to some minds so much difficulty. This difficulty has very frequently arisen from the mistaken idea that 'conversion' and

'regeneration' are to be used as interchangeable terms. A further question is frequently raised, namely whether the change wrought by Holy Baptism is an actual change of condition, or merely a change of relation towards God, and upon this point the Church of England has, as I think, pronounced no authoritative decision. It is certain that every person baptized has a right thenceforward to speak of God in a special sense as his Father.

"You ask (2) Do we receive in the Holy Communion the Body and Blood as taught in our Catechism? The Church of England abides by the teaching of the Catechism in its entirety, and this particular subject is more fully explained in Article XXVIII.

"You ask (3) Is it necessary to go to Confession before receiving the Holy Communion? To this I answer, *certainly not*. The Church of England does not recognise what is commonly called 'Sacramental' Confession, still less is such Confession inculcated by our Church as necessary.

"I have answered you very briefly because, as you will understand, it is not possible for me, in the course of ordinary correspondence, to enter fully and authoritatively into these matters.—I remain, yours very faithfully, A. C. CANTUAR."

Sometimes his answers to these letters were of a rather different sort. A worthy man, for example, wrote to him at some length, asking him to consider the question whether "since the Ascension of our Blessed Lord into Heaven," it was not right that the Lord's Prayer should be used with a clause as to His mediatorial work appended, "as is the rule in other Christian prayers." The reply, by the hand of his Chaplain, was—

"In answer to your letter I am directed by the Archbishop to say that it does not appear to him to be necessary that you should undertake to make any additions to the Lord's Prayer."

One detail in the Lambeth correspondence is worth perhaps a passing notice. Few people have any notion of the strange frequency with which requests are made to the Archbishop for the appointment of "a day of

general prayer," or "of universal observance throughout the Church" on behalf of this or that object which the writer believes to be of overwhelming importance. Could the Archbishop, by a series of quasi-papal rescripts, give effect to these requests—as he certainly could not—there would be few weeks left in any year for the Church's general teaching. Peace Sundays, Temperance Sundays, Missionary Sundays, Church Defence Sundays, Hospital Sundays, Education Sundays, have each of them their advocates, besides those who are eager for special Sundays to pray for rain, for dry weather, for preservation from cholera, for a blessing on the army, on the navy, on public schools, on prison work, and so on. The Archbishop set himself, with a few exceptions, to the strong discouragement of such requests, not only when they came from the irresponsible folk who seem incapable of estimating the difficulties of such arrangements, but even when the suggestion proceeded from men whose opinion is entitled to more weight. Witness, for example, the following correspondence with a veteran statesman and diplomatist who wrote to him during the Franco-German war:—

*Lord Stratford de Redcliffe to the Archbishop of
Canterbury.*

"ST. LEONARDS, *April 26, 1871.*

"MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP,—Though I hesitate in taking the liberty to address you, I nevertheless feel sure that your Grace will forgive the intrusion in consideration of its motive. In common with half the world, my thoughts have been long distressingly occupied with the calamitous events which in so brief a period have desolated an extensive portion of our nearest neighbours' empire, and brought it down to the lowest state of suffering and degradation. We, on the other hand, owing in part to the good sense of the nation, in part to the wise policy of our Government, but more especially to the gracious dispensations of Provi-

dence, have been allowed to enjoy the blessings of uninterrupted peace and undisturbed prosperity. The contemplation of these contrasting pictures, and the fearful apprehension that our vices and our seeming self-confidence expose us to the same perils as those under which humiliated France is now labouring, lead me to wish most earnestly that, under the guidance of their Church and Government, our countrymen may be persuaded to look upon the existing catastrophe in the light of a Providential warning, and may derive from that impression a sense of their dangers, and a more strenuous resolution to avoid the well-known causes of national confusion and its attendant calamities.

“With due submission to your Grace’s superior judgment I fancy that the appointment of a day of General Thanksgiving and Humiliation, with a view to the effect, which I have so imperfectly shadowed out, might not only make a most salutary impression on the millions, but gratify the National feeling, and do credit to those who exercise authority in Church and State.

“Under this conviction I have encouraged myself to venture upon this step, and whatever may be your Grace’s decision, I shall have the satisfaction of feeling that I have overcome a natural repugnance for the sake of discharging a conscientious, though somewhat questionable duty.—Your sincere and respectful servant,
STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE.”

The Archbishop of Canterbury to Lord Stratford de Redcliffe.

“INNSBRUCK, *May 11th*, 1871.

“MY DEAR LORD,—Your Lordship’s letter has reached me on my journey homewards. I can well understand the feelings, with which, in common with all thoughtful men of religious minds in the kingdom, you look upon the sad example we have seen of a nation full of such high thoughts of itself as have made it confident of its own strength without considering that a nation’s strength comes from above. I trust and pray that God’s goodness may save our own nation from the dangers which have proved so fatal to our neighbours. That it is the duty of every Christian man to beg this from God, we cannot doubt. Your Lordship’s suggestion of a day of humiliation and thanksgiving

would, I doubt not, be highly appreciated by many religiously-minded men.

"In the appointment, however, of such days, by the united authorities of the Church and the Government, many circumstances naturally influence the Government besides the minds of religious men, and especially I have found that there is a strict regard paid to precedent in such matters. I am, therefore, inclined to think that the wisest course is, for the clergy, and all who have influence, to use all the ordinary means in their power to direct the thoughts of our countrymen aright, and impress upon them the lessons to be learned from God's dealings with the nations, and that it is, on the whole, better not to urge the Government in the way your Lordship suggests.

"I shall, however, hope to see your Lordship before long, and talk with you on this subject.—Believe me to be, my dear Lord, yours most faithfully,

A. C. CANTUAR."

An Archbishop probably receives more than his share of abusive letters and post-cards, both anonymous and signed. Archbishop Tait's share was certainly a large one, and it is right to remember that, during several years of his Primacy, he was systematically vilified almost every week, in one at least of the 'Church' newspapers. Such extracts as the following, from its leading articles, read a little strangely now :—

"The refined, courteous, anxiously fair disputant [Canon Carter] is at a disadvantage with an antagonist who is entirely callous and unscrupulous, and quite as willing to stab with secret dagger from behind, as to strike with sword in front. . . . No person in England, belonging to the educated classes at all, is more profoundly unacquainted with all that belongs to the theological, historical, and spiritual side of the Church of England than her Primate, shrewd, canny, and well read as he is in some other branches of knowledge. . . . What music is to a man with no ear, that religion is to Archbishop Tait, and it is as idle to argue with him on religious questions, and on religious grounds, as it would be to play a pathetic composition of Mendelssohn's to a musically deaf person in the hope of softening his temper and extracting a boon from him." ¹

¹ *Church Times*, June 15, 1877.

Or again :—

“Even that large body of the clergy who, from polemical bias, or from dulness, failed to recognise or heed his untrustworthiness, so long as it was confined to such trifles as faith and morals, have been roused to hostility by his action on the Burials Bill. . . . He is casting about for some trap in which to take the souls of those who are not prepared either to yield through fear, or to sell their consciences to the highest bidder. . . . Crafty as the scheme is, the Primate not having either the retentive memory or the keen foresight which a man needs who embarks on a course of treason, has himself wrecked it beforehand.”¹ And so on.

Of such a style of controversy no notice could, of course, be taken, but, as regards his correspondence, the Archbishop would never admit that anonymity made a letter unworthy of attention. He used to maintain that he had been taught many lessons by such letters, and unless they were altogether nonsensical or coarse, he always read them carefully. Many, especially the ‘threatening letters,’ were mere silly endeavours to be funny, but there was a large residuum of sane and sometimes reasonable criticism, the only fault of which was its anonymity. Abusive letters, duly signed, he almost always answered, if only by a line of courteous acknowledgment. Sometimes he wrote more fully. To quote a single specimen out of many :—

Mr. ——— to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

“———, *March 18th, 1880.*

“REV. SIR,—I have been reading a pamphlet entitled ‘Fallacies of Unbelief.’ On page 9, you say—‘Respecting the first point, the existence of a soul within the material body, separate from it in nature as something spiritual and not material, this has never been disbelieved without a degradation both of the intellect and the moral character of man.’ As an atheist, I pro-

¹ *Church Times*, July 6, 1877.

test against such misstatements. Are you aware, Right Rev. Archbishop of Canterbury, that your brother Bishop, the Bishop of Manchester, says he regards, as a most alarming symptom, the acceptance of sceptical opinions by men of *high character and high moral tone*? Further on, he says—‘Honest doubt, however, ought not to be treated with contempt or unmitigated condemnation; for there are few, indeed, who have not been more or less in doubt.’ Are you, Archbishop of Canterbury, quite sure that, in the face of these admissions made by your brother Bishop, that you really possess all the morality, all the intellect; that you, with your £15,000 per year, wrung from the blood, bone, and sinew of the nation, have all the brain-power; and that the atheist has not the power co-equally to lay down his propositions, and as intelligently—ay, as intellectually—to demonstrate his conclusions for the governance of his life as you? Rev. sir, there are other points in your pamphlet I should like to discuss with you. Do not tell me that I am too humble or too small for you to meet. Remember that if your story be true, I have a soul to be saved, and you, as a national preceptor, have a duty to perform by saving it, the failure of which should haunt you like a spectre to your grave. In conclusion, I demand from you an apology for the insult you have offered to honest—not doubt, but utter denial. Awaiting your reply, I remain, yours very truly,

“ ——— ”

The Archbishop replied :—

“DEAR SIR,—. . . I do not think that you are correct in stating that the income of the Archbishop of Canterbury is wrung from the blood, bone, and sinew of the workers of the nation, nor, as far as I am aware, have the Archbishops claimed to have all the brain-power. . . . You quote a passage from the Bishop of Manchester, in which you tell me, ‘he regards as a most alarming symptom, the acceptance of sceptical opinions by men of high character and high moral tone.’ ‘Honest doubt, however, ought not to be treated with contempt or unmitigated condemnation.’ Now, a sceptic in the proper use of the word is, as you are aware, a man who *doubts* the truth of religion; and, as appears from the context, the word ‘sceptical’ is so used by the Bishop of Manchester in the passage you have quoted. In the close of your letter you tell me that your case, as an atheist, is

one of 'honest—not doubt, but utter denial.' It is scarcely needful for me, therefore, to point out to you that the Bishop of Manchester's words do not in strictness apply to your case. But the chief subject of your letter is, to ask an explanation of certain words which you quote from a pamphlet of mine entitled 'Fallacies of Unbelief.' I do not, by those words, intend to judge any individual. My intention was to point out what are the general effects of atheistical opinions, and I hold that any school of philosophy which dogmatically asserts that man has no soul, and that there is not a God, saps the very foundation of morality, and that all history proves the propagation of such opinions as a substitute for Christianity to lead to the degradation of the human race. I cannot but believe that if at present you claim for yourself the names of atheist and materialist, a time will come when you will perceive and gladly acknowledge that man is distinguished from the brute creation by something higher than a finer organisation of his material frame, and that there is a Being higher than man who watches over him in life and in death with a Father's love.—I remain, yours very truly,
"A. C. CANTUAR."

He honestly valued criticism, however stern, or even abusive, and he used to say that if he had been cured of certain early habits of awkwardness in public speaking, it was entirely due to seeing himself "wholesomely caricatured." In a still smaller matter, I remember an instance which may be worth recording. Early one morning I received a message bidding me go to his dressing-room with the Newspaper-extract book. Knowing that he never worked before breakfast, I was puzzled. I found him with his tailor, who was trying on some new gaiters. He took the ponderous extract-book from me and slowly and gravely turned over its pages, till he came to a *Punch* cartoon, in which he had been represented with great cleverness and wit, in an ungainly attitude, and certainly without flattery.¹ Pointing solemnly to the

¹ The cartoon in question will be found in *Punch* for May 17, 1878.

picture he said to his tailor, who stood wonderingly by, "I want you particularly to notice how the British public regards your gaiters."

Looking back upon the daily correspondence of those busy years, the characteristics which stand out most vividly in my recollection are, I think, three.

First, his invariable anxiety to regard the matter rather than the manner of every letter he received. "Angry? of course he is. Never mind that. What is it he asks me to do?" The letter might be prosy and longwinded, or curt even to rudeness. It might be overflowing with personal grievances, or sternly reticent and reserved. It was all the same. "What is his point? What do you gather are the facts?" If the story was a long one, especially in Colonial matters, where our geography or history were perhaps at fault, he would make us write out for him in black and white a brief cold statement of the unvarnished facts; and then, if necessary, he would go into the whole matter with that strange penetration which seemed to carry him straight to the point of a controversy, whether in great things or small. I have never known any one else who could, with the same quick clearness, disentangle the threads of an intricate correspondence on some entirely novel subject. He would always dictate an answer or decision the moment he had listened to the letters, and would then leave it if necessary to 'simmer' for a day, and to be criticised from end to end before it was sent off. And generally, if the matter was a complicated one, he would at the last moment, before signing the letter, restate the case aloud, in a few clear sentences, as he walked about the room. "The man asks me to do so and so. I have answered that I won't, and for two reasons: First, that it isn't my business; and secondly, that I think

he is in the wrong. Will that do?" Of course there may be nothing peculiar or original in this way of doing business, but it became so regular a habit with him, that I have thought it worth recording.

Next, I remember his constant anxiety that no letter should seem harsh or unkind. It used to be a joke among his secretaries that when he had written some severe or stern reply to a controversialist or complainant, he would always say to us, "See if that is quite kind." But it was perfectly genuine, and again and again he has kept an official letter or memorandum back until the following day, saying, "Let us see to-morrow morning whether it looks unkind." Or again—a very frequent order—"Tell him he's a consummate ass, but do it very kindly."

I am afraid his treatment of the begging letters that came by every post would have scandalised the sterner theorists of the Charity Organisation Society. He used to declare his due belief in all the orthodox rules, but I am bound to add that he consistently broke them every day, not so much by giving without knowledge or inquiry—for that was rare—as by never refusing help if the need seemed real, though the request would obviously reappear a few weeks later. If difficulties were suggested, he would almost always refer his critic to the sentence in the Bishops' Consecration Service—

"Will you show yourself gentle, and be merciful for Christ's sake to poor and needy people and to all strangers destitute of help?"

"I will so show myself, by God's help."

Perhaps the weakest side of his character was the difficulty he felt in saying No to such requests, or similarly in refusing ordination to good but incompetent men. From the popularity of the Diocese of

Canterbury, and the consequently high standard which can be required before a man is even admitted as a candidate, this last difficulty has scarcely ever to be faced. But it does happen now and then; and his examining chaplains have a vivid recollection of the fights they had to wage on such occasions in the interests of a just severity.¹

The same kindness appeared in the genuine distress he experienced on finding, as was sometimes the case, that he had accidentally given needless pain. The following correspondence with a friend is a significant though trifling instance:—

“MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,—I am sorry to hear that you tell a good story . . . at my expense. If it were true of me I should think it rather hard measure to deal out to a man to impute foolish vanity and self-conceit to him at forty-seven, because he may have been guilty of such things at twenty-one—perhaps not the only man who at such an age was ever guilty of them. But I think you must know that the story was never true of me at all. . . . Though I have often seen it told in papers maliciously enough against me, I have always held my tongue. When an Archbishop gives it currency I venture to protest. . . . You must not be offended with me if I confess that I heard of your story with pain and with regret.—Believe me always, your dutiful son and servant,
— — —”

“MY DEAR —,—I am quite ashamed that I should have given occasion for your friendly remonstrance, and I consider it a really friendly act in you to have called me to order and told me your feeling. . . . I did tell an often-repeated story, which I learn from your letter had not any reference to you. I am sure, however, that any one who was present would testify that while telling the story . . . I spoke with no appearance of unkindness. I have never failed either in respect or regard for so old a friend. I think it is a shame that any one should have been so fond of

¹ Twice at least within his last five years the chaplains were unsuccessful, and it is fair to add that in one of these instances the Archbishop's leniency has been strikingly justified by the result.

gossip as to repeat what passed at our family breakfast-table as a mere joke. But I am sure you will forgive me, and I believe that I shall henceforward be more careful, in the case of all my friends, to avoid jokes which, if repeated, might even by possibility do mischief. . . .”

“MY DEAR ARCHBISHOP,—I cannot enough thank you for your very kind letter. There is an end of the matter in my mind, except that I shall not forget the letter which it drew forth, and which I truly value. You must remember that it is only when one cares a great deal about the speaker that it is worth while to notice what is said.—Always your grateful friend and servant,

“ ——— ”

The third characteristic which comes back to me in recalling the correspondence of those years is the unfailing humour with which he lightened the drudgery of every day. No amount of prosiness on the one hand or of petty ill-temper and spitefulness upon the other could usually avail to spoil his quiet good-humour or provoke him into irritable replies. I doubt whether this had been quite the case in his earlier years, but in my secretarial time it was indisputably true. It was as though he was somehow upon a higher level, which set him above the strife of tongues and pens. ‘Self-control’ would be a misleading description of what I mean. It was rather that he seemed, in almost every case, to stand outside the arena of the strife, and even to see it in a humorous rather than an irritating light. For his more copious and angry correspondents he had a series of kindly pseudonyms of his own, though they were never whispered beyond the walls of his study. I fancy I can hear him now dictating his grave replies to Jannes and Jambres, Socrates and Xantippe, Euodias and Syntyche, to Gil Blas, and Meg Merrilies, and Uncle Tom. To suppose that there was in this habit the slightest vestige of contempt or flippancy, with respect either to the matters or the men with whom

he had to do, would be altogether to misapprehend him. But the strain of monotonous work, and the tension of difficult situations, may oftentimes be lightened and relaxed by one who has a keen, and withal a good-natured, eye for the humorous side of even the gravest facts of life. It is perhaps a rare quality in ecclesiastics, and in most men it is not without its peril. In the Archbishop it was accompanied by an earnestness so intense, and a sympathy so tender, that I do not believe he ever, in this particular way, gave a moment's pain to any one.¹

In Bishop Ewing's Biography there are some delightful letters describing his visits to Bishop Tait at Fulham. In one of these he uses an expression characteristically terse and true. "Bishop Tait is exactly the same as ever, good, humorous, and Scotch, with gravity."² It is not easy for those who were members of the family circle to say anything of the rare grace and beauty of the quiet home life at Fulham or Lambeth or Addington.

"As I look back," says one who has an exceptional right to speak, "upon the years of my intimate intercourse with him, the impression left on my mind of the beauty of the Archbishop's relationship to those of his own family, is even more strongly marked than the impression of his clear strong judgment and wide views upon all matters affecting the welfare of Church or State. To see how a man, as ceaselessly occupied as he was with public affairs, was yet able to combine with these the very tenderest relations—free and happy and unreserved—towards his own family, gave one an ideal, practically realised, of what family life should be."

So too with his friendships. It was often noticed how men who had little else in common shared the intimacy of his confidence, and it may be said, I imagine, with exceptional and absolute truth, that he never lost a friend, even

¹ See *Quarterly Review*, vol. clv. p. 7.

² *Life*, page 373.

among those who dissented widely from portions of his public policy.

Reference has been already made to his constant letters of sympathy to those in trouble or bereavement. They were usually of the simplest kind, but they came from his very heart. I am allowed to quote one or two.

The following was written to a friend in 1867 :—

"I almost fear that before this reaches you, your beloved boy will have left you. How bitter the trial to parents none can know but those who have gone through it, and if it please God thus to visit you, long indeed will it be before any brightness can return to life. I trust it may yet please God to preserve him to you, and make him grow up to be a blessing to many. But if he is taken, the thought of the sorrows and trials he escapes will gradually comfort you, and there is certainly something that raises and cheers in the assured belief that our children are already with Christ ready to welcome us when, through His mercy, we ourselves shall be admitted to the same glorious presence. The death of a child, and of such a child, has in it an inexpressible sweetness, when we can forget the suffering and all the harrowing details, in the one thought that he is with Jesus. We ourselves are able to think calmly what a far better lot has been given to our beloved Catty and May, than if now in the 21st and 20th years of their early womanhood, they had been beginning the real difficulties of life here amongst us, though God knows how sweet was the companionship which they gave promise of affording us had they been allowed to stay with us till now. . . . Thank God in Christ there is a better world.—
Affectionately yours,
A. C. LONDON."

The following, on the death of Frederick Maurice, was written to his brother-in-law, Dr. Plumptre, afterwards Dean of Wells :—

"ADDINGTON PARK, *April 2*, 1872.

"MY DEAR PLUMPTRE,—The sad news conveyed by to-day's *Times* has thrown a gloom over all the best friends of our Church. I know of no death since Arnold's which has been felt

in the same way. And yet, perhaps, Maurice had done his work. We might have desired for him a few more years, that he might have spent a calm old age amongst us, but it is well that he has been saved from the sadness and suffering of decaying powers. And the testimony of his life abides. But who is to fill the place which Frederick Maurice has left vacant? Alas! the younger Broad Churchmen have not the depth of his piety. Speculation without love or light is a very different thing from the tone of mind which he fostered. I know no one of the School who has his depth of piety. I call to mind the many Sundays in which I used to walk down to Lincoln's Inn, when I visited London from Carlisle.¹ Cotton in his way was a light of the same kind; but he was known only to a few before he went to India, and perhaps it was only in the remarkable breadth and depth united of his Christianity, that he was like Maurice. Of course he had not his genius.

"Mrs. Tait joins with me in all sympathy with your wife.—
Ever yours, A. C. CANTUAR."

The following was written in 1881, on the day of the funeral, to a friend of many years, who had lost his wife:—

"I sit down on this, to you, most melancholy day, not with the view of saying anything that can stay your grief. I know too well that is impossible; but Christian hearts are soothed by sympathy, and I know myself, at least, that Christian sympathy, expressed by kind friends, has helped me on my way in many trials. We remembered you all at our morning prayers in chapel to-day. I trust God has sustained you through the weary hours. It is pleasant now—when the actual presence of a visible shadow from death has been removed from your house—to be able to look forward to the bright future. I cannot tell how those can feel, or how they can be sustained at all, who sorrow with little hope. Thank God, it has been my blessed lot that every death in the inner circle of my own dear home has been the departure of a saint to the presence of a much-loved Friend. This thought must rob such sorrow of its bitterness, and this thought is abundantly given you in the departure of the loving,

¹ See vol. i. p. 164.

faithful, untiring, unselfish wife who shared with you on earth so many years of happiness, and who will be ready now to meet you in the Lord's good time, when you too enter on His presence. Certainly our conviction of the absolute and overwhelming reality of the truths we have so long possessed respecting God and Christ and His Kingdom, and the rest of the saints in Him, must be deepened in us, if we are Christians, by our being brought so near to the unseen world, and so linked with it in every tenderest thought through seeing those we most dearly love actually pass into it. Life here can never be to you the same again: it must be entirely changed. But the time is short, and during the years that remain may your three sons . . . be to you as great a comfort as my three daughters and R. have been to me, in what, without their loving care, must have been to me a very desolate old age. Occupation, I grant—continual work—is a great help; but, especially as we grow old, we cannot work always. Let us thank God that we have children to help us on."

One more such letter, on the death of his almost lifelong friend, Dean Johnson of Wells:—

"STONEHOUSE, 10th Nov. 1881.— . . . As the sad hour of the funeral came, I went down to our cliff, which commands a view of the limitless sea, and read the service which has filled so many eyes with tears to-day in Wells. Looking out on the sea, and marking the boats on its surface, some labouring in the waves, others briskly borne on their course—all destined for a haven, all exposed to a thousand unforeseen perils—I had before me an image of that life on which each of us, for over fifty or sixty or seventy years, has been sailing. It is pleasant to think of a loved friend of fifty years as safe in the haven. There was surely in his character that wonderful mixture of simplicity, with gentleness and true humility, which saves an intellect like his from many of the trials of a great intellect, and moulds the whole into a bright Christian faith. How we shall all miss his love, or at least the visible manifestations of it. My four oldest friends, Constable, Wildman, Stanley, and he have all died within a few months. . . . God in Christ comfort you."

It is time to pass from his correspondence, and to say

something of his public speeches. It was by these far more than by his letters that he left an impress on his time, and yet it is not very easy to describe wherein their real strength lay. Many of them have been quoted in these volumes, and it is clear that, compared with the speeches of some of his contemporaries, there was in them neither the flow of lofty eloquence, nor the magic of brilliant description, nor the force of incisive repartee. Their effectiveness, however, is undisputed and indisputable. Whether in the House of Lords, or at a City banquet, or on the platform of a public meeting, his words were certain to tell, and to tell, I think, increasingly, as his years advanced. His speeches have often been contrasted with his sermons. Carefully—perhaps over carefully—as his words might be prepared, he seemed never to be at his best in the pulpit; and it was our constant effort in his later years to persuade him, when he was called upon to preach, to give a short unwritten address, instead of preparing the manuscript sermon which he himself preferred. No explanation of this undoubted contrast between his platform and his pulpit utterances is to me quite satisfactory. In his London Episcopate he usually wrote his sermons with the utmost care—great bales of them exist—and he used to correct and alter them for subsequent delivery, often when driving to the church, in hieroglyphics intelligible to himself alone. On one such occasion (I believe in August 1865) he was thus preparing a sermon on his way to Enfield. Driving down Holloway Hill he heard a loud noise behind, and looking round saw a runaway horse with a heavy dray making straight for his carriage. He stood up, sermon in hand, to watch the course of events, and as the head of the runaway approached the carriage he threw the open sermon in its face. The horse was so bewildered by the fluttering

of the leaves that it swerved and paused; the driver regained control; the sermon was picked up, and the Bishop proceeded on his way.

"I was driving back with him from Enfield that afternoon," writes Bishop Maclagan, "when he said to me, with the half-suppressed smile on his face, which was itself so full of humour, 'I don't know whether my sermon did any good to the congregation to-day, but it was of considerable service to myself this morning,' adding, as he finished the story, 'I don't suppose the poor beast ever had such a "blatter" of theology before.'"

Of his Parliamentary speeches, Lord Granville, than whom there could hardly be a better judge, has written as follows:—

"Having probably heard every speech he made in the House of Lords, I should like to say a few words as to his position in that Assembly, and the hold he obtained over its members. Of all our great speakers none had more the gift of persuasiveness, after all the chief merit of public oratory. Whatever might be the disposition of the hearer on the particular question in discussion, it was difficult not to want to agree with the speaker. This feeling was produced by a sense of his strength, earnestness, gentleness, and charity. He united, to a remarkable degree, dignity and simplicity. To great sympathy with others he joined a great perception of the ridiculous, the expression of which lost none of its effect from its being restrained, partly from what he felt due to his office, and partly from his fear of giving pain. I may be wrong as to the causes which I have given for it, but I have no doubt of the power he exercised over the minds of his peers."

The effectiveness of his speeches at City banquets and kindred gatherings has already been referred to, and knowing, as I often did, how he had had absolutely no time beforehand to think of what he was to say, I have again and again been amazed at his readiness in evolving his thoughts with an easy and quaint originality when actually on his legs.

Table of
our Saxony

—

h

ノ

٢

2.

4

—

I.

Ch. scattered ^{to water} ~~to land~~
Brethren from distant lands
Welcome

at St Augustine's
~~Rifing~~ College
we have united in
highest act of worship

clergy read their
of several Dioceses

His readiness in debate has been sometimes ascribed to the total absence of all nervousness. Such is far from being the fact. He has often told me that he never rose to speak, especially in Parliament, without a feeling of intense nervousness, and in the last few years of his life this was made apparent to those who knew him best by the convulsive twitching of his enfeebled arm for many minutes before his speech began. I invariably accompanied him to the House of Lords, and I heard every speech he made there—and they were not a few—during my six chaplain years. Only one was, I think, ineffective—it was his last—a speech in answer to the Duke of Argyll's proposal for an alteration of the Parliamentary Oath. His voice had been husky and low, his manner almost hesitating, and as he returned to his room, he whispered with a pathos I shall never forget, "They didn't listen to me. It is the first time for twenty years. My work is done."

The notes for all his speeches were made in the same form—a series of narrow columns on folded quarto paper, sometimes crossed and re-written till they seemed illegible. The notes reproduced in facsimile upon the opposite page were prepared for his address in Canterbury Cathedral to the Bishops assembled for the Lambeth Conference of 1878.¹ The fewer the notes, whether for speech or sermon, the better, I think, was the result. The most effective sermons I ever heard from him were the quiet and almost unpremeditated 'talks' in the village church of Addington, or to Confirmation candidates in the last years of his life. His addresses, too, in Ordination weeks were almost always weighty and memorable. He was at his best, whether in church or out of it, when dealing with the fundamental realities of the spiritual life. There, from his

¹ See above, page 369.

early days, his deepest sympathies had lain, and the recollection of this fact explains not a little of his policy in the earlier Church troubles of his London years.

The venerable Bishop Whipple of Minnesota has described a visit which he paid to him at Fulham in the year 1864 :—

“One night,” he says, “as I was sitting in my room, Bishop Tait rapped at the door, and came in to ask me some question about a recent conversation. As he was leaving again, I said, ‘Will you pardon me if I ask you a question? I know your theological views. Why do you permit the ritualism of those clergy in East London?’¹ I shall never forget the deep feeling he showed, as, with tears in his eyes, he answered, ‘Bishop, those men realise that those poor lost souls can be saved, and that Our Blessed Lord is their Saviour as He is ours. Who am I, to meddle with such work as they are doing, in the way they think best, for those who are going down to death?’”

In complete accord with this was the intense devoutness of his personal life. The subject is one on which it is impossible to dwell at length, but the testimony of his really intimate friends would, I think, be unanimous, as to the lessons they had learned from the quiet and transparent simplicity of the daily prayers he offered, with his household, with his children, and with those who came to see him in anxiety or sorrow. It would have seemed to him unnatural not to kneel down daily in his dressing-room with his personal servant, or to say a prayer from his sick-bed with the nurse who attended him in his last illness. One might take, I think, as the motto of his life, the opening verse of the Book of Wisdom—“Think of the Lord with a good heart, and in simplicity of heart seek Him.”

Two things, he always said, were essential to a man's due discharge of each day's round of monotonous and

¹ Alluding, of course, to Mr. Lowder and his colleagues.

often tiresome duties. The first, to keep the spirit fresh by constant prayer. The second, to quicken and enlarge the intelligence by the constant reading, under whatever difficulties or drawbacks, of books upon other subjects than those belonging to his working hours. Every one who has followed the Archbishop's Diaries must have been struck by the extent of his general reading, even at the busiest periods of his life, and especially perhaps by the number of Novels he was able to read and to enjoy. It may be said that in his later years, when he was able for less riding, and for much less walking than formerly, a good novel was his most invigorating form of recreation, and he had, quite to the last, an almost boyish keenness for the dénouement of each plot or story. From his Oxford days onwards he had always enjoyed foreign travel. In his old age, perhaps he enjoyed it mainly on account of the larger opportunities it gave him for quiet reading in the open air. The weeks he spent at Pégomas¹ in the last year of his life were, I think, notwithstanding his ill-health, among his happiest, and I never saw him more full of lively interest in everything he read.

"It is delightful," he writes to an old friend and former secretary,² "to be at rest here, while the world is speculating on my resignation, and the *Lancet* is dissecting my bodily health. We have perpetual sunshine, and lovely drives among olive-covered hills, and perfect peace away here in the country, six good miles from the world of Cannes."

By the end of April in that year (1882) we were back at Lambeth, and, as his Diary has shown, he entered with almost his usual vigour upon what was to be the closing chapter of his work.

Three things stand out in my memory as characteristic of that summer. The first is his determined and buoyant

¹ See pp. 546, 547.

² Now Sir John Hassard.

hopefulness about the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, as likely, in the providence of God, to result in allaying the unworthy strifes which were impeding the Church's nobler work.¹ The second is his untiring labour upon the question of Cathedral reform. Although he did not live to see the outcome of the Commission over which he was presiding, he was already well assured of its ultimate success. The third is the determination he evinced to make one more strenuous effort to promote united action in the field of Foreign Missions. By his successful insistence on the appointment of a Bishop of the Church of England—and not of any society within it—to superintend the Missions in Japan, he inaugurated a policy which may have larger results than men yet see.²

The work of that session was beyond his strength. It was in fear and trembling that we watched him day by day, and we were warned that at any moment a crash might come.

He has described how he left Lambeth in July with a true foreboding that he would return no more. He was intensely anxious that nothing should prevent him from himself confirming the two sons of the Prince of Wales, and during his long illness he, many times over, expressed his thankfulness that he had been allowed, as his last public act, to discharge that task. It was shortly after his return from Osborne that his illness took a graver form.

In the closing days of August, the end seemed almost

¹ It has sometimes been said that if Archbishop Tait had lived, the Report of the Commissioners might have been drawn on other lines; it is right, therefore, to point out that its general tenor was decided upon while he was still in the chair.

² The arrangement at which he arrived, after infinite trouble, was that each of the two great societies should furnish one-half of the Bishop's salary, and that the Bishop himself should be appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Archbishop Tait died before the actual appointment of Bishop Poole, but he had already secured his point.

to have come, and on Sunday evening, September 3, a special service was held, by the Archbishop's own desire, in the little village church of Addington, not to pray for his recovery—for this he did not ask—but to bring home, if it might be, to his cottage neighbours to whom he could no longer speak, the lessons of the quiet sick-room in their midst, and of what appeared to be the dying-bed which had so solemn an interest for them all. He arranged the service himself, selected the Psalms, the Lessons, the Hymns,¹ and took counsel with the preacher, his dear friend and Suffragan, Edward Parry, Bishop of Dover, as to the words he was to say.

“It was his own wish that we should hold this service,” said the Bishop of Dover, in his sermon. “No one suggested to him the thought: it came from himself. He does not ask you to pray for his recovery. . . . He wanted something more than that: he wanted you who are here, rich and poor alike, to catch to-night the echoes that come from his sick-room; he wanted you to look upon his illness as a lesson sent to you by God, and to take to your hearts the voice of solemn warning, which bids you—each of you—be ready for the hour of death. I have known him now, boy and man, for forty years—and what he would want me to do to-night is simply this, to speak to you about Jesus Christ, the Way, the Truth, and the Life, and to point you to Him who is the True Shepherd of the sheep. ‘I am the Good Shepherd’: they are words of comfort and affection. ‘He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.’”

While the service was being held in the Parish Church, he had the same service in his room. He thought—we all thought then—that the end was close at hand, but gradually in the next fortnight the evil both in heart and lungs grew less acute, and the doctors encouraged us to hope that he might yet again—as thrice in former years—come back from the very gates of death to resume some

¹ Psalms xxiii., xci., Isaiah xxxv., Rev. xxi. 9, and the hymns, ‘O God, our help in ages past,’ and ‘Jesu, Lover of my soul.’

part at least of the work which he seemed to have laid down. This time, however, it was not to be. Day by day it became apparent that, though the actual illness had almost disappeared, his strength was exhausted, or, as the doctor expressed it, the oil in the lamp was insufficient to keep the flame alight, after all he had gone through.

But his work was not really over, for his quiet sick-room in these darkening autumn days was a veritable centre of peace, and strength, and guidance, and encouragement, to not a few who were to work on when he had left them. As the acuter stage of his illness came to an end, the look of pain and weariness passed quite away, and for many weeks he was full of keen and vigorous interest in all that was going on, and enlivened the business of each day with the same quiet humour as of old. He had no wish, I think, for recovery, and what he dreaded above all things was that his life should be prolonged as a helpless invalid. "Think of those old gentlemen one sees at watering-places," he used to say, "dragged about in bath-chairs, and triumphantly exhibited by their friends as 'in full possession of their faculties!'" True to himself, he attended without fail to each day's letters as they came, and nothing in public affairs, either at home or abroad, seemed to escape his notice.

He was eager, as always, for the arrival of the newspapers, and he was able, usually without confusion or fatigue, to listen all day long to one reader after another. The list of books to which he steadily gave his mind in the quiet of his sick-room in the months of October and November is surely a remarkable one. He was constantly thinking of what would suit the inclination of the reader who happened to be with him at the time, and he liked to give his running comments—quick and shrewd and earnest as of old—upon every book in turn. The following

is a note of the books thus read to him in his bed, within a period of less than nine weeks:—

“Large portions of Macaulay’s *History of England*, especially the chapters on the Non-jurors, and on the Scottish war. Macaulay’s *Essays on Warren Hastings* and on *Lord Clive*. Dean Church’s *Anselm*. Mrs. Oliphant’s *St. Francis of Assisi*, and the account of the Franciscans in Canon Farrar’s *Saintly Workers*. A great part of Farrar’s *Early Days of Christianity*. Dr. John Brown’s *Horæ Subsecivæ*. Many short American Stories. George MacDonald’s *Annals of a Quiet Neighbourhood*. Eight or nine different Articles in the current *Edinburgh* and *Quarterly Reviews*. *Westward Ho!* *Esmond*. *Peveril of the Peak*. A large part of Carlyle’s *Cromwell*. Carlyle’s *Diamond Necklace*. Mrs. Gaskell’s *Ruth*, and *Mary Barton*. Miss Ferrier’s *Inheritance*. Blaikie’s *Life of Livingstone*. Mrs. Beecher Stowe’s *Old Town Folks*. Various Articles on America by Professor Goldwin Smith. *Democracy*. Miss Powell’s *Household of Sir Thomas More*. Mr. Cave Browne’s *Lambeth Palace*. Dean Stanley’s *Church of Scotland*, and *Occasional Sermons*, and Tom Hughes’ *Life of Daniel Macmillan*.”

Besides these, he asked repeatedly for passages from the *Pilgrim’s Progress*, from St. Augustine’s *Confessions*, from Jeremy Taylor’s *Holy Dying*, and from Richard Baxter’s *Retrospect of his Life*. To this last he returned time after time, especially as the end drew near.

And for his more strictly devotional hours, the privilege of daily ministering to him in those long weeks of illness is one that cannot be forgotten by those on whom the duty lay. Never did the manly courage of his Christian faith assert itself with more unaffected simplicity than in the “quietness and confidence” of the daily prayers in that sick-room. To be with him at such an hour was to receive in very truth “the peace of God which passeth all understanding.”

And with the reading and the letters, there were long and interesting talks on every subject, past, present, and to

come. I had never learnt so much as I did then about his earlier years—his life at Glasgow, and Oxford, and Rugby, and the changes in the Church of England since the time when his London Episcopate began. And he would sum up his experiences, and then look quietly forward :—

“It is better I should go now. Other men will do the new work better. The Bishop of Winchester is a man of peace. The Bishop of Truro will come forward and do a great work. For me, twenty-six years is long enough. I am worn out. But I have worked hard, I do think, especially in those London years. How I have failed and fallen short, God knows, but I did try to preach the plain Gospel and to make others do it too. That is what I have tried to make the basis of my work. I think Evangelical Gospel truth first came home to me when I was at Glasgow, from the preaching of two men—Dr. Welsh of the Ramshorn Church (he was a good man), and a Mr. George Smith. Baldon days were full of interest, and at Rugby I did try to preach the Gospel to the boys.”

To the question of his successor he recurred again and again, but oftener at the beginning of his illness than at its close. One evening, when he had been speaking of his hopes both for Bishop Harold Browne and Bishop Benson, I asked him, “Should you like me to say anything of this to the Dean of Windsor¹ or to any one else?” He paused for a long time, and then said quite decidedly, “No ; not, at all events, as a message from me. God has not laid on me that responsibility? It is in other hands, and I have no wish to assume it.”

The companionships of those last weeks brought vividly back the associations of his former years. Lady Wake was there, watching him with the same loving motherly care as in his childhood, seventy years before ;

¹ Dean Wellesley was then alive. He died on September 17, 1882, three months before the Archbishop.

and Mrs. Peach, the old nurse and friend, who could recall each detail of his Rugby days, and of the darkened spring-time in the Carlisle Deanery; and Edward Parry, his pupil at Rugby, his first Domestic Chaplain in London, his loved and trusted counsellor and Suffragan; and Erskine Knollys, closest and best of friends in every joy and every sorrow that the years had brought. Scarcely less, too, did he prize the visits and the ministry, from time to time, of others to whom he looked, with characteristic confidence, for the carrying on, in future years, of the work for which he had cared so long. Is it wrong to add that the whole Church is the gainer for the personal link thus forged or strengthened, between himself and his successor in the Primacy?

One by one, as the end approached, other friends of his busy years came to bid him good-bye, and sometimes to receive his counsel upon the Church's needs.

"Knowing that I was starting on a visit to America," writes Bishop Thorold,¹ "he sent an urgent message to me one Saturday to see him as soon as possible, and my visit to him next day, a glorious Sunday afternoon, has wrought itself into the roots of my memory. The first matter on which he wished to see me, as one of the Trustees of the Endowment Fund, was the Anglican Bishopric in Jerusalem, then vacant, and apparently in danger of remaining so. In very earnest words he pressed on me as a solemn legacy of duty, to do all in my power to keep alive an instrumentality for good, which was by no means limited to the Evangelisation of Hebrews in their Holy City, but which, as a vital though indirect influence on the decayed and slumbering Christianity of the East, might eventually help to quicken it into new life, as well as be an important testimony to Mohammedans.

"He thanked me for coming, said he did not expect to get better, and did not wish for it, and then, rising higher on his

¹ Now Bishop of Winchester.

pillow, and speaking slowly and with effort, and with often failing breath, he went on, as one delivering a farewell message, to dwell with marked and even sombre impressiveness, on what he felt to be the want of real religion in the Church, on the prevalent, melancholy insistence on forms and ceremonies, and on the great importance of uniting as much as possible with all who truly loved and served God. He added that circumstances had helped him to be especially in sympathy with other Christian bodies. He alluded with regret to a sermon recently preached by a very eminent divine on the duty, even the necessity in the near future, of separating Religion from the State, and he told me of the paper he had sent from his sick-bed to *Macmillan's Magazine* on Mr. Mozley's *Oxford Reminiscences*. Then he became exhausted, and, repeating to him the grand promise out of Deuteronomy, 'The Eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the Everlasting Arms,' I left him for my journey of 10,000 miles. At Denver I heard, by telegram, the good news that he had rallied. Several times after my return I saw him. During these last visits two things struck me and still abide with me: How with the widest and tenderest respect he constantly spoke of old friends passed to God, who in the course of years had widely diverged from himself, either Romeward or in the direction of unbelief: How sorrow, and the gathering years, and the nearing vision of God, had mellowed and almost beatified one who, when I first knew him twenty-six years before, on his coming to the See of London, was the very ideal of strength, and whose strength as he neared his end seemed lost and transfigured in charity."

Bishop Maclagan of Lichfield, who saw him even later, writes:—

"I thought him looking very feeble and greatly changed, but I was never before so much impressed with the indefinable charm of his countenance. When I inquired about his health, his answer was, 'We are in God's hands; He has brought me through great troubles in past days.' In the course of our conversation he said, 'I hope you are not a great alarmist about the present state of things.' I replied that I was not at all. He most kindly warned me against trying to do too

much, and spoke with a very warm interest about my Lichfield work. Before I left him he asked me to say a prayer for him. When I had ended, I asked for his blessing. As I knelt beside him, he laid his hand upon my head, blessing me with very solemn and loving words. I bade him good-bye, knowing only too well that I should see his face no more."

He had other like interviews with several friends, including the Bishops of London and Winchester, the Dean of Westminster, the Dean of Durham,¹ the Master of Balliol, and Prebendary Cadman. He saw his chaplains one by one, and the servants, who had some of them been with him from the Fulham days. Constant and watchful to the last was James Kersley, his inseparable personal attendant, whose bright activity had made his name a household word for years among friends of every grade. These farewell interviews over, a few days yet remained before the end. He had for several weeks been anxious about the consecration, on St. Andrew's Day, of Wyndham Kennion, appointed at his instance to the Bishopric of Adelaide. The consecration took place, as arranged, in Westminster Abbey, the Bishop of London officiating in the Primate's room. He insisted on my leaving him, for a few hours, to attend the consecration, and, later in the day, the newly-consecrated Bishop came to Addington on the bare possibility that he was not too late to receive the Archbishop's blessing. We doubted if it were possible, but the Archbishop desired to see him. Placing his trembling hand upon him as he knelt at the bedside, he spoke a few solemn words of benediction :

"The Lord bless him, and keep him, and make him a blessing. We thank and praise Thee for all the blessings Thou hast given him, and pray Thee that in the great work to which he is called he may be blessed to others for many

¹ For an account of this interview see Note A, page 603.

years. . . . Bless the Church to which he is going. Bless the Churches in these Islands, and unite them together, through the mediation of our God and Saviour, Jesus Christ."

He complained of weariness after Bishop Kennion had gone, and repeatedly expressed his belief that it would be his last night on earth, and his thankfulness for so quiet a close. Early next morning we were all summoned, as his strength seemed to be ebbing fast. He bid a separate farewell to each, and then asked for the Commendatory Prayer. He gave the Benediction in a steady voice, and then added, quite in his usual manner—"And now it is all over. It isn't so very dreadful after all." A few hours later he rallied, and asked for the Holy Communion. He followed the service carefully, and again gave the Benediction. For some hours he lay still, and we doubted whether he was fully conscious. In the afternoon Lady Ely arrived from Windsor with a message of affection from the Queen. When we told him of it, and asked him to send some message, he roused himself, and, with the utmost vigour, said, "No. I will see Lady Ely at once." He spoke to her, quite naturally, of his love and gratitude to the Queen. We offered to write down any message he had to send, but he said emphatically, "No. I will write it myself. Give me pen and paper." Raising himself up, he tried to write the words, repeating them carefully aloud that we might write them too, as he could not guide his pen. "A last memorial of twenty-six years of devoted service: with earnest love and affectionate blessing on the Queen and her family.—A. C. CANTUAR."

After this he spoke very little more, but was anxious for prayers and hymns at intervals, especially the Commendatory Prayer from Bishop Andrewes, which he had always used and loved.

At seven o'clock on Advent Sunday morning, his

breath came slowly and more slowly ; then ceased, and he was at rest. It was on Advent Sunday, four years before, that his wedded life of five-and-thirty years had ended, and he had wondered many a time in those autumn weeks if he should spend Advent Sunday upon earth, or, united again with those whom he had loved, in the immediate presence of the Lord.

As we look back now upon the long and sometimes anxious waiting of those autumn weeks, with their eager interchange at first of hopes and fears, the memory seems altogether bright. There was a long and peaceful glow about the sunset of his life, and the days were never days of gloom. I may be allowed, perhaps, to quote a page from the diary of his youngest daughter ; she, too, has since then passed to join him in the larger world beyond.

“After that Sunday evening service,” she writes, “in which he bid us pray for him in the village church, we had three more months of quiet watching and waiting : watching and waiting first with a hope that though slowly, he was surely, gaining ground, and would, in God’s love, be with us some time more, doing more work here for Him : watching and waiting afterwards for the day and hour of the home-going, as the work here was done, well done, and finished in God’s love. How thankful we all are for those months ! It was a quiet, happy time in spite of the anxiety and need of patience both for him and us. . . . They will be a help to us all our life, I think, those quiet watchings : such a feeling of peace, of finished work, and of waiting for the Master’s call to go home. We always feel as if we had spent that time like the pilgrims in the Land of Beulah, waiting for the messenger and the crossing of the river, and he was like Mr. Stand-fast, for ‘the day he was to cross, there was a great calm at that time in the river,’ and the river was so quiet and so shallow, that ‘he stood a long time in the water talking to those who had come with him to the water’s edge.’”

CHAPTER XXXIV.

ADDINGTON CHURCHYARD—THE MANSION HOUSE— TWO EPITAPHS.

1882-83.

THE question at once arose, Where ought he to be laid to rest? . He had always taken for granted that it would be in Addington Churchyard, under the cross he had himself erected above the simple grave of his wife and son. But not a few, who had on public grounds a right to speak, were anxious that he should lie in Westminster Abbey, and before sunset on that Sunday, the offer of a resting-place within the Abbey was duly made. His family were anxious that their own strong preference for Addington Churchyard should not be allowed unduly to govern the decision, and the question was submitted that night to the personal judgment of the Queen. It was no small relief to those who had watched beside his bed when the Queen decided that, under all the circumstances, the wish of his daughters ought to be respected, and that the grave should be, as he had hoped, in Addington Churchyard.

None who were present will easily forget that scene: the white mantle of snow that covered the countryside, the utter stillness of the winter air, the trees of the long elm-avenue wreathed with white hoar-frost, the slow voices of the bells from one church and another across the snow-bound fields, while the long procession wound slowly through the Park, following the plain hand-bier which had carried so many Addington villagers to their rest, now borne by the loving hands of men who were

every one of them his friends; and then the bright triumphant service led by the village choir, and the great gathering of some of England's foremost men, with the Queen's two sons at their head, beside the open grave. All was solemn to the last degree in the very strength of its simplicity, and in its quiet appropriateness to the lessons of his life.

Steps were immediately taken by the public to place appropriate memorials in Canterbury Cathedral, in Westminster Abbey, in Rugby School Chapel, in Edinburgh, and elsewhere. The decoration of Lambeth Palace Chapel, begun by him a few years before, was completed by general subscription, and a fund was raised to promote the Evangelistic agencies with which his name will always be associated. The Prince of Wales became chairman of the Committee, which was joined by men of many denominations. The memorials were inaugurated in a great meeting held at the Mansion House on January 26, 1883, under the presidency of the Duke of Albany. A few sentences may, perhaps, be quoted from the speeches then delivered, as illustrating from various sides the public appreciation of his unwearied work :—

"I am glad," said the Duke of Albany in a memorable speech, "that this scheme is brought forward in a place and before an audience which imply that the memorial is, in the fullest sense of the word, a National one. For the desire to do honour to the late Primate is not confined to his own clergy, or even to his own Church, but is shared by the public in general—by all, I may say, who feel admiration for a high-minded dignitary, or respect for an indefatigable worker, or love for a good man. Archbishop Tait was all these; and English history, which records so many heroes of duty, can scarcely point to a purer instance of the single-mindedness which forgets self in great public objects, or of the conscientiousness which makes a man refuse, under any pressure of temptation or weariness, to do less than his utmost, or to be less than his best. . . . [It is well] to perpetuate the memory of an Archbishop whose aim it ever was to merge his

personality in his office, who will be remembered, not so much for individual traits or marked originality, as for the manner in which he identified himself with his exalted functions, so that the national ideal of an Archbishop of Canterbury is likely for many a generation to be unconsciously moulded on the character of Dr. Tait. . . . It was his effort to remain among conflicting schools of thought as the central exponent of the spiritual side of our national life; to represent, not any passing phase of opinion, but that tolerant and manly seriousness which lies at the root of our national greatness. . . . We must be thankful that in England, amidst all our speculative differences of opinion, we have so little of that fierce antagonism which rages in some other countries—that false opposition between reason and reverence—as though in this world of awful mysteries a spirit of arrogant irreverence were not the very maddest unreason. That we are spared such conflicts is largely due to such leaders as our late Primate. . . . He has passed from our bodily sight. He has gone, to use his own words, ‘to fuller light and larger liberty.’ But we are met to-day to show that though he is no longer visibly present with us, his spirit is felt in our midst more powerfully perhaps than ever before. We are met to show that England is not the less ready to honour her worthiest heroes, because it has never occurred to them to imagine that they have achieved any special claim to honour by doing what was no more than their duty.”

Lord Granville, who was to have seconded the resolution, was at the last moment kept away by illness, and the letter which he wrote has been referred to on a previous page.¹ Mr. G. J. Goschen, as a former captain of the school at Rugby, recalled the memories of his old Head-master, and with reference to the work of later years, continued:—

“It is not only the Church, it is the State, which may be grateful to the Archbishop who conducts the work of his office as Dr. Tait performed his work. The faults of an archbishop would spread far beyond the Church itself, and the virtues of an archbishop have an influence far beyond the Church of which he is the spiritual head, in the State as well as in the Church. . . . I think that of Dr. Tait it may be truly said that he had energy

¹ See p. 584.

without passion, earnestness without bigotry, and authority without imperiousness. May the memory of his ripe wisdom, of his great patience, and of his great good-humour, long survive his death, and may a worthy memorial be raised by national subscriptions among all classes of the community, to one who has deserved so well of us all."

Lord Shaftesbury made special reference to Bishop Tait's evangelistic work in London, and Mr. Samuel Morley, as a Nonconformist, paid an earnest tribute to the value of his efforts "to promote friendly relations among all who have our common Christianity at heart." Among the other speakers were Mr. Beresford Hope, Canon Barry, Canon Farrar, and the Dean of Durham.

Two epitaphs, from master-hands, may be subjoined. The first was written for Rugby Chapel by the Archbishop's successor in the Primacy:—

NE · VESTER · SACER · PARIES

NOMINE · CETERIS · CARO · VOBIS · PROPRIO · VIDEATUR · INDIGERE

ARCHIBALDI · CAMPBELL TAIT

HIC · LEGITE · VIRUM · ANIMO · VERE · RUGBEIENSI · ATQUE · ARNOLDIANO

OCTO · ANNOS · ARNOLDO · PROXIMOS

VOBIS · PRAEFUISSE · PROFUISSE

ACADEMIAE · QUI · ANTEA · OXONIENSI · IN · DELICIIIS · HABITUS

CAPITULO · POST · CARLEOLENSI · SEDIBUS · LONDINENSI · CANTUARIENSI · PRAEFECTUS

XIII · TANDEM · ANNOS · IN · PRIMATU · GERENDO · VERSATUS

TOTIUS · ANGLIAE · IMMO · MAIORIS · BRITANNIAE

INDOLEM · VIRILEM · CUM · SIMPLICI · PIETATE · CONIUNXIT

IUDICIO · SENSUQUE · OMNIUM · COMMUNI · PLUSQUAM · OMNES · USUS

PARTIBUS · NIHIL · MULTUM · PACI · CONCEDENDO

MORUM · ORATIONIS · PRUDENTIAE · GRAVITATE · SALE · SECURITATE

PATRIBUS · ET · SENATUS · ET · ECCLESIAE · CONSILIIANTIBUS

AUCTOR · SANUS · SAPIENSQUE · PLACUIT

TANTUM · VIRUM · DEUS · VITAE · DISCIPLINA · PAENE · TRAGICA

UT · FILIUM · IPSI · ACCEPTUM · ERUDIEBAT

DOMUM · AD · SUOS · REVOCAVIT

IN · DCA · PRIMA · ADVENTUS · A · DNI · MDCCCLXXXII · AET · LXXII

The second, from the pen of Dr. Vaughan, Dean of Llandaff and Master of the Temple, is inscribed upon the monument in Canterbury Cathedral, under the admirable recumbent effigy by Sir Edgar Boehm :—

A GREAT ARCHBISHOP

JUST, DISCERNING, DIGNIFIED, STATESMANLIKE,
WISE TO KNOW THE TIME AND RESOLUTE TO REDEEM IT.

HE HAD ONE AIM :

TO MAKE THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND MORE AND MORE
THE CHURCH OF THE PEOPLE:
DRAWING TOWARDS IT BOTH BY WORD AND GOOD EXAMPLE
ALL WHO LOVE THINGS TRUE AND PURE
BEAUTIFUL AND OF GOOD REPORT.

NOTE A.

IN the former volume (pages 102-109) is an important letter from Dean Lake of Durham, recounting his reminiscences of the Archbishop's Oxford years. The following letter is supplementary to it, and deals with the later period of his life. It has been found impossible, without spoiling its completeness and proportion, to find an appropriate place for it on an earlier page.

“DURHAM, 24 *September* 1890.

“MY DEAR DEAN OF WINDSOR,—There is perhaps not very much that I need add to what I have already written to you for the purposes of the Biography. But there are a few subsequent reminiscences which I should be glad to record.

“The Archbishop's life as Bishop of London and Archbishop of Canterbury is a matter of history; and avoiding as much as possible the expression of opinion, I shall try to confine myself to statements of facts and conversations. Being much in London at that time, as a member of the first Education Commission, I saw him constantly during his whole tenure of the Bishopric, and he used to speak unreservedly on all Church questions, such as the St. George's disturbances (he always knew that I thought his line of conduct entirely mistaken), and the prosecution, then just beginning, of Mr. Mackonochie. I well remember the pain which the latter caused him. I was with him when he first heard of it, and when he thought, rightly or wrongly, that it was his duty to let it proceed. ‘But is it not most painful?’ he said, ‘for I know well his devotion, and the great work he is doing among the poor.’ But in this, and in similar cases, I believe that there was a marked difference between his line both of thought and action as Bishop of London and the last five or six years of his life at Canterbury.

"During this last period—owing to accidental circumstances—I saw less of him than I had done previously. His great illness in 1869 had, if I may venture to say so, the same effect as the terrible loss of his five children, in making him view everything in a more gentle and tender light ; but it had also another effect at first, which was very evident, and which I remember the late Bishop of Winchester being much struck with, in making him almost nervously anxious to get some important work on hand, which he thought was required by the Church. First, in 1873, he had some long discussions at Lambeth on Cathedrals, for which he brought together many Bishops and most of the Cathedral authorities. But this came to nothing, and then in the following year (1874) he introduced the Public Worship Act. Of this I would rather say nothing, but any impartial narrative will make it clear that in many essential particulars it was, at least in its final form, not the Archbishop's Act. One of the points which he most strongly insisted upon, and which in practice has greatly mitigated the Act, was the Bishop's Veto. Whether he was right in finally managing to carry the Bill, may be open to much doubt : but my impression is that he believed that he was settling the question, and preventing the introduction of a Bill of more destructive character in both Houses.

"Two or three occasions impressed upon me his strong desire for peace, and his wish to discourage prosecutions. First, when he came to stay at Durham, on his way from Scotland—a month or two after the passing of the Public Worship Act in 1874. Almost as soon as he had arrived, he said : ' Now let us talk over the effect of the Public Worship Act ' ; and on my asking him what he expected the results to be, they seemed so slight that I said laughingly, ' Oh, if that is all you expect, it will be just what Gladstone prophesied, a mere *brutum fulmen* ' ; to which he answered at once : ' Well, I don't care if it is a *brutum fulmen*, as far as the present state of things is concerned ; what I want to prevent is things going much further, for in that case we should really become Roman Catholics.' I give this without any comments of agreement or disagreement, but I am sure of its accuracy. How far the prophecy was correct is another question ; but the tone quite agreed with a letter which, some years afterwards, he read to me before it was sent, on the prosecution of Mr. Enraght, which he strongly discouraged. He expressed, however, in lively terms, his belief that the letter

would have no effect on the Bishop to whom it was sent, nor had it any. The last occasion when I witnessed the same spirit was in the examination of a gentleman, before the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission,¹ who attacked the Archbishop vigorously for having supported the Bishop of Lichfield in allowing the singing of the 'Agnus Dei' at the Communion Service. Here again the Archbishop treated the objection with great indifference; as I had before heard him mention privately that the introduction of hymns into the Communion Service stood upon the same footing as their introduction into other services.

"In the autumn of 1882 began the illness of the Archbishop which terminated fatally. Being then in the Tyrol, I returned to England immediately, and found for the time a great change for the better. This, however, did not continue, and at the end of November I saw my friend at Addington for the last time. I have some hesitation in sending you the account of my last visit; but as it refers in a great measure to matters of interest to the Church, I do not like to withhold his opinion. I send it you, therefore, in the words in which it was written on the following day, Nov. 29, 1882:—

"'Yesterday, for what I feel to be the last time, I saw the Archbishop of Canterbury. I had hesitated to go to Addington, from fearing that the last visits of his friends might be too great a trial for him. But after writing to Davidson, I determined yesterday to go. At the station I met the Master of Balliol, who was going with the same purpose, and we travelled to Addington together; the Bishop of London followed by a later train. The Archbishop had already, on that morning, bidden "farewell" to several of his old servants; and Davidson thought he would be hardly well enough to see me before the afternoon. Davidson meanwhile spoke to me fully of the Archbishop's strong feelings on the interests of the Church, which had engaged his latest thoughts greatly. He had a very anxious feeling with regard to his successor, but one which he would not allow to be communicated to Mr. Gladstone, lest it might in any way embarrass him; "God," he said, "has placed in his hands the responsibility, and with him it must rest." Davidson thought that the Archbishop would hardly be strong enough to speak on this point; but he did so.'

¹ See *Report of Eccles. Courts Comm.*, vol. ii. page 170.

"The Archbishop sent for me before lunch. He was looking very thin and pale, but he did not appear to me so altered as he did to others. After some expressions of warm feeling from each of us, he said, 'Ah! this is a blessed way to die, surrounded with so much love and affection! I have known, too, so little of suffering in all these last months, while others have suffered so much; it is only of late that it has been distressing.' Something was said by me of the time we had spent together in early life, and of our happy days together at Balliol. 'Yes,' he said; 'does it not seem wonderful to look back on those days now? and upon you, my friends and pupils. What a variety of character and of work! And yet I do trust and believe that it has been all directed by God for good. What different characters were yours and Stanley's! And yet it was impossible for us both not to love him. And the dear Master of Balliol, too [he had just seen him], he has been always kindness itself to me.'

"'And now,' he added soon after, 'my work is done, and who do you think they will have for my successor?' And he then expressed his wish that it might be the Bishop of Winchester, adding, 'They would not have a gentler, a more loving man; and though it might not be for many years, the next few years will be such important ones for the Church. . . . And then to speak one word of all these troubles,—I do trust they will pass.' 'Have you heard,' he said very earnestly, 'about Mackonochie? It is most remarkable. I wrote to him, imploring him not to allow the case of St. Alban's to come again before the Courts, and he has sent me his promise to resign his cure.'

"This is the substance, and nearly the words, of what was said. Once or twice, when the Archbishop seemed tired, I wished to stop, and Agnes, who was in the room, suggested doing so. But he said, 'No, I wish to go on.' At last, I thought he was evidently fatigued, and said—'Dear friend, give me your blessing before I leave,' and knelt down. He laid his hand upon my head, and gave, with great solemnity and many tears, the full blessing of 'the Peace of God.' He added, 'Will you and your dear wife pray for me?' and then I left him, to see him no more in this world.

"I have very little to add to these last solemn remembrances. I have not attempted to give any general estimate of a character so true and affectionate in its friendship, and, if my feelings do not deceive me, with so many points of greatness. But having

known him for nearly fifty years so well, I may venture to say that the basis of his character was always a high and unselfish sense of duty, combined with great practical gifts of good sense and tact, firmness and calmness. He early felt that he was called to an active life ; and after he had been elected Head-master of Rugby, he may perhaps have felt that he would probably one day be called to a higher position in the Church. But he was quite free from that wretched form of ambition, which has led men to grasp at high ecclesiastical preferment, and I cannot remember his ever alluding to the subject. When he was appointed Bishop of London, he expressed his extreme surprise. 'I might perhaps,' he said, 'have thought it possible that I should become a Bishop, but certainly never that I should be Bishop of London'; and I feel sure that he did not allow himself to desire the Archbishopric of Canterbury when it was vacant. Speaking generally, I always thought that his natural gifts—tact and public speaking amongst them—fitted him rather for a statesman than an ecclesiastic ; and I have ventured to express my opinion that in his Episcopal life he made serious mistakes, both in word and action. But when we think of the manner in which, born and bred in a different communion, he gradually learned, in a time of great difficulty, to understand and even to sympathise with all the varieties of the English Church, and of his constantly increasing determination to do justice to them all—a determination which, I believe, would have gone much further, if his life had been preserved ; and when we remember his strong hold on the laity, no less than upon the affection and respect of the clergy, I cannot help believing that, in the opinion of all parties, very few Archbishops of Canterbury have for centuries discharged the duties of that great post with so much dignity, ability, and devotion.—I am, yours very truly,

"W. C. LAKE."

TABLE showing the CONTEMPORARY BISHOPS OF ENGLAND

	Canterbury	York	London	Durham	Winchester	Bangor	Bath and Wells	Carlisle
1856	J. B. Sumner	Thos. Musgrave	A. C. Tait	C. T. Longley	C. R. Sumner	Chr. Bethell	Lord Auckland	H. M. Villiers
1857								
1858								
1859						J. C. Campbell		
1860		C. T. Longley		H. M. Villiers				Sam. Waldgrave
1861				C. Baring				
1862	C. T. Longley	W. Thomson						
1863								
1864								
1865								
1866								
1867								
1868	A. C. Tait		J. Jackson		S. Wilberforce		Lord A. Hervey	Harvey Goodwin
1869								
1870								
1871								
1872								
1873					E. H. Browne			
1874								
1875								
1876								
1877								
1878								
1879				J. B. Lightfoot				
1880								
1881								
1882								

	Llandaff	Liverpool	Manchester	Newcastle	Norwich	Oxford	Peterborough	Ripon
1856	A.H. Ollivant		J. P. Lee		S. Hinds	S. Wilberforce	George Davys	C. T. Longley
1857					Hon. J. T. Pelham			R. Bickersteth
1858								
1859								
1860								
1861								
1862								
1863								
1864							F. Jeune	
1865								
1866								
1867								
1868							W. C. Magee	
1869								
1870			J. Fraser			J. F. Mackarness		
1871								
1872								
1873								
1874								
1875								
1876								
1877								
1878								
1879		J. C. Ryle						
1880								
1881								
1882				E. R. Wilberforce				

AND WALES, during the EPISCOPATE of ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL TAIT.

[illegible]

Rochester	St. Asaph	St. Alban's	St. David's	Salisbury	Truro	Worcester	Sodor and Man	
Geo. Murray	T. V. Short		Connop Thirl- wall	W. K. Hamilton		Henry Pepys	H. Powys	1896
								1897
								1898
J. C. Wigram								1899
								1800
						H. Philpott		1801
								1802
								1803
								1804
								1805
T. L. Claugh- ton.								1806
								1807
				G. Moberly				1808
	Josh. Hughes							1809
								1870
								1871
								1872
			W. B. Jones					1873
								1874
								1875
A. W. Thorold		T. L. Claugh- ton.			E. W. Benson		Rowley Hill	1876
								1877
								1878
								1879
								1880
								1881
								1882

NOTE C.

OWING to the fact that it has not been possible to observe strictly chronological order in the narrative of the Archbishop's life, the following table of its principal events may be found serviceable.

VOLUME I.

- 1811. Birth of A. C. T. (Dec. 21), 9.
- 1814. Death of his Mother (Jan. 3), 12.
- 1819-20. The Whitworth "Doctors," 15-18.
- 1821. High School, Edinburgh, 18.
- 1824. Edinburgh Academy, 20.
- 1826. "Dux" of the School, 23.
- 1827. Enters Glasgow University, 25.
- 1829. Snell Exhibitioner, 32 ; Matriculation at Balliol, 33.
- 1830. Begins residence at Oxford (Oct.), 39 ; Confirmed, 38 ; gains Balliol Scholarship, 39.
- 1832. Death of his Father, 49.
- 1833. President of the Union, 44 ; Graduates with First Class, 49 ; "Tracts for the Times" started, 52.
- 1834. Death of Betty Morton, 51 ; First Journey abroad, 55 ; gains Balliol Fellowship (Nov.), 55.
- 1835. Tutor of Balliol, 57.
- 1836. Ordained Deacon, 57 ; Curacy of Baldon, 59.
- 1838. The Glasgow Professorship Question, 64-68.
- 1839. Residence at Bonn, 69, 70 ; Pamphlet on Oxford Education, 71.
- 1841. Publication of Tract XC., 78 ; the Four Tutors' Protest, 81.

- 1842. Elected Head-master of Rugby (July), 111.
- 1843. Marriage to Catharine Spooner, 122.
- 1845. Condemnation of W. G. Ward, 126-130 ; Journey to Italy, etc., 123-125.
- 1847. Dr. Hampden's Bishopric, 132.
- 1848. Dangerous Illness, 134-136.
- 1849. Appointed Dean of Carlisle (Oct.), 137-149.
- 1850. Residence at Carlisle, 154 ; University Commission appointed, 156-159.
- 1852. Carlisle Cathedral restored, 178 ; Report of the University Commission, 165-170.
- 1854. Legislation on University Reform, 174.
- 1856. See of Carlisle vacant, 186 ; Death of Dean Tait's five daughters (March-April), 189, 190 ; Consecrated Bishop of London (Nov.), 205.
- 1857. The Westerton Judgment, 217 ; London Evangelistic Work, 252-264 ; Divorce Bill, 210-213 ; Diocesan Home Mission, 497, 498.
- 1858. Ritual Troubles, 218-222 ; the Confessional Question, 223-228 ; Primary Charge (Nov.), 265-269.
- 1859. St. George's in the East Riots, 230-249 ; All Saints', Margaret Street, 420.
- 1860. "Essays and Reviews" published, 277.
- 1861. Episcopal Letter on "Essays and Reviews" (Feb.), 282 ; Correspondence with Dr. Temple, 287-301 ; Debates in Convocation, 301-305.
- 1862. Bishop Colenso's "Pentateuch" published, 335 ; Death of Archbishop Sumner, 270 ; Offer of Archbishopric of York, 271 ; Second Diocesan Charge, 444-480.
- 1863. The Subscription Controversy ; Bishop's Letter to Archdeacons, 492 ; "Essays and Reviews" before the Privy Council, 313 ; the Colenso controversy in Convocation, 348 ; Stanley appointed Dean of Westminster, 516 ; Foundation of the Bishop of London's Fund, 446 ; the Capetown Trial of Bishop Colenso, 351-355.
- 1864. "Essays and Reviews" Judgment, 315-323 ; Consecration of St. Alban's, Holborn, 423.
- 1865. Bishop Colenso excommunicated, 359 ; Consecration of St. Michael's, Shoreditch, 439 ; Clerical Subscription Act, 495.

- 1866. Bishop Tait's Circular to Colonial Clergy, 370; Convocation Resolutions against Ritualism, 405; Bishop's serious Illness, 470; the Cholera in Bethnal Green, *ib.*; return of his Illness, 471; Third Diocesan Charge published, 472, 483.
- 1867. Ritual Commission appointed, 409; its First Report, 410; the First Lambeth Conference (Sept.), 376-382; Controversy with Bishop Gray, 384-387; Sir R. Phillimore's Judgment on the Mackonochie Case, 429.
- 1868. Continued Controversy about Natal, 388-396; Privy Council Judgment on the Mackonochie Case, 435; Death of Archbishop Longley; Bishop Tait becomes Primate, 535.

VOLUME II.

- 1869. Disestablishment of the Irish Church, 1-43; Lord Shaftesbury's Ritual Bill, 110; Dr. Temple nominated to Exeter, 57-62; Archbishop's dangerous Illness (Nov.), 48-56.
- 1870. Bishop of Dover consecrated, 53-57; the Revisers' Communion at Westminster, 63-74; the Vatican Council, etc., 76-85; the Voysey Case, 88-90; Final Ritual Report, 128; Archbishop winters abroad, the Rev. C. W. Sandford acting as Commissary, 87-90.
- 1871. The Purchas Judgment, 92-97; Lord Shaftesbury's Ritual Bill, attitude of Archbishop Tait and Bishop Wilberforce, 113; Lectionary Bill, 130; Athanasian Creed agitation, 125-135; Illness of the Prince of Wales (Dec.), 106.
- 1872. Issue of Letter of Business for Revision of the Rubrics (Feb.), 277; Shortened Services Act, 110; Lord Shaftesbury's Ritual Bill once more, 114; Athanasian Creed agitation, 136-162; Primary Archiepiscopal Charge, 148.
- 1873. Change in Court of Final Appeal, 117-121; Petition for Licensed Confessors and consequent agitation, 164-175; Death of Bishop Wilberforce (July), 495; the Madagascar Bishopric Question, 340-349.
- 1874. Public Worship Regulation Act, 186-227; Ordination of Craufurd Tait, 229; Questions about the Colonial Episcopate, 338.
- 1875. Pastoral Letter of the Bishops on Ritual, 270; the Ornaments Rubric in Convocation, 277; the Ridsdale Case begins, 237; the American Revivalists, 507.

1876. Burials Bill Discussion in Parliament, 383 ; Re-Arrangement of Court of Appeal, 320 ; Conference with Nonconformists, 503 ; Second Archiepiscopal Charge, 481.
1877. The Ridsdale Judgment, 239 ; Ritual Cases at Hatcham, Wolverhampton, etc., 254-262 ; "The Priest in Absolution," 171, etc. ; Devotional Meetings at Lambeth, 293 ; Craufurd Tait in America, 324 ; the Croydon Church Congress, 295-300.
1878. Additional Bishoprics Bill, 325 ; Death of Craufurd Tait, 326-329 ; Second Lambeth Conference, 329, 362-377 ; Marriage of Edith Tait, 333 ; Death of Mrs. Tait, 334.
1879. The Bordesley Case, 264-266 ; Mr. Marten's Burial Act, 390 ; Ritual Debates in Convocation, 415-419.
1880. Ceylon Missionary Troubles, 353 ; The Government Burials Act, 390-412 ; Imprisonment of Clergy, 422 ; Speech at Westbere, 423 ; Third Archiepiscopal Charge, 409-481 ; Mr. Green's Imprisonment, 453-467 ; Sunday-School Centenary, 532. //
1881. Ritual Memorials and Counter-Memorials, 425, 426 ; Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, 445-452 ; Death of Dean Stanley, 541 ; Death of President Garfield, 543.
1882. Address to St. Martin's League, 483 ; Last Journey abroad, 468, 546 ; Work on the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, 588 ; Confirmation of the Sons of the Prince of Wales, 550 ; Last Illness, 589-596 ; Death, 507.

INDEX

- ABERDEEN, EARL OF**, Ministry of, i. 173.
 Addington Village and Church, ii. 45, 517, 598.
 Alban's, St., Holborn, i. 422 (*see* Mackonochie).
 Albany, Duke of, ii. 546, 599.
 Albert, H.R.H. Prince, i. 158, 206.
 — Victor of Wales, Prince, ii. 549, 588.
 Alford, Dean, i. 528.
 All Saints Church, Margaret St., i. 416 ff.
 Allen, Rev. Hugh, i. 236.
 Altar-cards, ii. 201.
 Altar Lights, i. 219, 417 (*see* Ritualism).
 Architecture, base, in London, speech on, ii. 499.
 Arnold, Dr., i. 86, 102, 106, 110.
 — Matthew, i. 107, 115; ii. 303.
 Athanasian Creed Controversy, ii. 125-162, 207 *n.*, 418.

BAGOT, RICHARD, Bishop of Oxford, i. 57.
 Baldon (*see* Marsh Baldon).
 Balliol College, Oxford, i. 38-73.
 Baring, Bishop of Durham, ii. 271.
 Bath, Marquis of, ii. 31, 210, 219.
 Baxter, Mr. R. D., i. 531.
 Beauchamp, Earl, i. 410; ii. 42, 318, 382, 455.
 Bennett, Rev. W. J. E., i. 215.
 Benson, E. W., Head-master of Wellington College, afterwards Bishop of Truro and Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 207; ii. 39, 59, 592, 593.
 Bersier, M., ii. 528, 547.
 Bible Society, ii. 530.
 Bishop of London's Fund, i. 443-447, 499; ii. 232, 308.
 Bishops' Retirement Bill, i. 194.
 "Black-stone" Examination, i. 29 *n.*
 Blomfield, C. J., Bishop of London, i. 99, 194, 196, 197, 250; ii. 126.
 — Rev. F., i. 208.
 Bodington, Rev. Charles, ii. 254 ff.
 Bonn, residence at, i. 69.
 Bordesley Case (*see* Enraght).
 Bradley, G. C., Dean of Westminster, i. 115 *n.*; ii. 542, 595.
 Brett, Robert, i. 436.
 Bright, Canon, ii. 144.
 Brodie, Sir B., i. 57; ii. 108.
 Brotherhoods, Lay, i. 501.
 Brougham, Lord, i. 18.
 Browne, Harold, Bishop of Ely and of Winchester, i. 360, 379; ii. 83, 84, 207 *n.*, 216, 221, 222, 335, 592, 595.
 Buchanan, Professor, i. 26, 31 *n.*
 Bullock, Rev. W. T., ii. 346.
 Burgon, Dean, ii. 161.
 Burials Controversy, i. 407; ii. 378-412, 534.
 Butler, Arthur, i. 140-148.
 — Rev. W., i. 367, 375, 383, 450.

CAIRNS, EARL, ii. 22, 26, 32, 37, 39, 40, 41, 193, 210.
 Campbell, Ramsay, i. 36, 37, 38, 63, 208; ii. 124.
 — Sir Archibald, of Garscube, i. 32 and *n.*
 — Sir Ilay, i. 5, 7, etc., 13, 32 *n.*

- Campbell, Susan, wife of Craufurd Tait, i. 5.
 Cannes, residence at, ii. 91.
 Canterbury, Archbishop of (*see* Sumner; Longley).
 Cardwell, Lord, i. 40, 44, 369.
 Carlisle, Bishop of (*see* Bishop Percy, Waldegrave, Villiers, Goodwin).
 — Cathedral Restoration, i. 178.
 — Chapter, i. 176.
 Carnarvon, Earl of, ii. 31, 32, 41.
 Carson, Dr., i. 19.
 Carter, Rev. T. T., i. 450; ii. 68, 72, 74, 183, 267, 268, 420, 431.
 Cathedral Commission, ii. 518, 521, 526, 588.
 Cecil, Lord Robert, i. 174, 195 (*see* Lord Salisbury).
 Ceylon Missions, ii. 352-358.
 Chambers, Mr., M.P., ii. 131.
 Chaplains, duties of, 552-558.
 Charges of Bishop Tait—
 Primary (1858), i. 60, 225, 265, 480.
 Second (1862), i. 444, 480, 486, 489.
 Third (1866), i. 466, 480, 482, 484.
 Primary Archbishopial, ii. 148.
 Second — ii. 481, 529.
 Third — ii. 409, 482.
 Chelmsford, Lord, ii. 90, 93 *n*.
 China, Missions to, ii. 349-351.
 Cholera Epidemic in 1866, i. 440, 467-471.
 Christian League, ii. 506.
 Church Association, i. 400.
 — Memorial from, ii. 115, 180 *n*.
 — Defence Institution, ii. 491, 532.
 — Missionary Society, ii. 342, 352, 358, 529, 545.
 — *Times*, i. 331 *n*, 401, 414 *n*.; ii. 419, 561, 571, 572.
 — Union (*see* English C. U.).
 Church, R. W., Dean of St. Paul's, i. 130; ii. 424, 425.
 Churton, Whitaker, i. 40.
 Claughton, T. L., Bishop of Rochester, ii. 207 *n*.
 Cleveland, Duke of, ii. 33.
 Close, Dean, ii. 197.
 Clough, Arthur, i. 40, 72, 107.
 Cockburn, Henry (Lord), i. 18, 20, 21, 23, 150.
 Colenso, Bishop of Natal, i. 313, 327, 332-397; ii. 305.
 Coleridge, J. D. (afterwards Lord), i. 40, 107, 171, 199.
 "Committee of Clergy," ii. 177.
 "Confession," Auricular, i. 223, 226, 227, 454; ii. 163-185, 414.
 Connaught, Duke of, ii. 517.
 Cook, Rev. F. C., i. 524, 526.
 Copleston, Bishop of Colombo, ii. 352-354.
 Cornish, Bishop of Madagascar, ii. 349.
 Cotterill, Bishop of Grahamstown, i. 205, 351.
 Cotton, Rev. G. L., Bishop of Calcutta, i. 116, 117, 120, 205, 208; ii. 91.
 Cranworth, Lord, i. 212.
 Craufurd, Ronald, i. 4.
 Croydon Church Congress, ii. 295-300, 323.
 Cumloden, i. 5, 6.
 DALE, REV. PELHAM, ii. 421, 422, 429, 432.
 Dampier, Mr. John Lucius, i. 159.
 Davidson, Rev. R. T., ii. 457, 459, 460, 461, 470, 477, 479.
 De Broen, Miss, her Mission in Paris, ii. 526.
 Denison, Archdeacon, i. 302, 321, 348, 405; ii. 145.
 Derby, Earl of, i. 163.
 Devon, Earl of, ii. 31, 219.
 Diocesan Home Mission (London), i. 261, 497.
 Disestablishment, ii. 490-494 (*see* Irish Church).
 Disraeli, B., Lord Beaconsfield, i. 535; ii. 3, 7, 18, 27, 120, 192,

193, 213, 215, 226, 230, 321, 388, 447, 448.

Divorce Act, i. 210 ff.

Dupanloup, Bishop, ii. 523.

Durham, Bishop of (*see* Baring, Lightfoot).

Durham Letter (*see* Papal Aggression).

Durnford, Bishop of Chichester, ii. 207 n.

EARDLEY-WILMOT, SIR JOHN, i. 40.

Ebury, Lord, i. 407, 488, 489; ii. 381.

Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, ii. 431, 437-453, 588.

Eckington, ii. 519, 530.

Edinburgh Academy, i. 20, 36.

Edinburgh High School, i. 18, 19, 36.

Edouart, Rev. A. G. (*see* Exeter Hall Services).

Ellicott, C. J., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, i. 380; ii. 140, 165.

Elmdon, i. 122; ii. 532.

English Church Union, i. 399, 401, 437; ii. 88, 232, 325, 432, 462.

Enraght, Rev. R. W., ii. 264-266, 420, 422.

Essays and Reviews, i. 277-325, 520.

— Privy Council Judgment on, i. 315.

— Resolution of Convocation, i. 322.

Evangelical Alliance, ii. 505.

Ewing, Bishop of Argyll, ii. 124, 430, 579.

Exeter, Bishop of (*see* Phillpotts, Temple).

Exeter Hall Services, i. 256, 257, 258.

FENDALL, REV. JAMES, i. 312.

Final Appeal, Court of, ii. 117-123, 319.

Fisher, Rev. E. H., i. 535, 540; ii. 518.

Folkestone Case (*see* Ridsdale).

Four Tutors' Protest, i. 73, 81, 82.

Fraser, J., Bishop of Manchester, ii. 126, 376, 453 n., 456, 472, 473, 562.

French Protestants in Canterbury Cathedral, ii. 315, 515.

Froude, Richard Hurrell, *Remains*, i. 62.

Furse, Rev. C. W., i. 400.

GARSCADDEN, i. 13.

Garfield, President, Sermon on, ii. 543.

Garscube, i. 13, 37.

Gell, Rev. F., i. 208.

George of Wales, Prince, ii. 549, 588.

George's in the East, St., i. 228-245.

Girls' Friendly Society, ii. 518.

Gladstone, Right Hon. W. E., i. 108, 156, 159, 170, 195, 212, 478;

ii. 2, 3, 6, 9-15, 19-22, 37-39, 41, 42, 45, 54, 57, 58, 60, 114, 117, 119, 134, 212-215, 439-446.

Glasgow University, i. 25.

— Professorship of Moral Philosophy, i. 64.

— Professorship of Greek, i. 65.

Glenalmond, Trinity College, i. 100.

Glendevon, i. 37.

Gloucester, Bishop of (*see* Ellicott).

Golightly, Rev. C. P., i. 60, 85, 88, 128.

Goodwin, Harvey, Dean of Ely, i. 402, 410; Bishop of Carlisle, ii.

207 n., 234.

Goschen, Right Hon. G. J., i. 147; ii. 600.

Gorham Judgment, i. 214.

Goulburn, Rev. E. M., i. 40, 57, 69, 71, 107.

Granville, Earl, ii. 38, 40, 342, 382, 386, 584.

Gray, Bishop of Capetown, i. 336, 339, 348, 349, 350, 351, 353, 355,

357, 359, 365, 371, 373, 375, 380, 381, 383, 385, 388, 391, 392; ii.

72, 316, 338, 343, 345.

Green, Rev. S. F., ii. 420, 450-473.

— J. R., ii. 538.

- Gregory, Canon, i. 410 ; ii. 406, 424 *n.*
 Grey, General, ii. 23-26.
 — Lord, ii. 19, 131.
Guardian, The, i. 152, 248 *n.*, 261, 266, 400 *n.*, 401 *n.*, 414 *n.*, 420 *n.*, 438, 445, 498 ; ii. 64 *n.*, 95, 135, 161, 253, 268, 271, 294, 339, 355, 422 *n.*, 429, 430, 431, 455 *n.*, 525.
 Guillemard, Mr., i. 130.
 Gull, Sir W., ii. 49, 87, 107, 324.
 Gurney, Mr. Russell, M.P., ii. 212.
- HALE, ARCHDEACON, i. 492 ; ii. 53.
 Hall, Alexander Hall, i. 40, 62.
 Halley, James, i. 31, 33.
 Hallsteads, i. 191.
 Halyburton, Lord Douglas Gordon, i. 19.
 Hamilton, Walter Kerr (afterwards Bishop of Salisbury), i. 63.
 Hampden, Dr., Bishop of Hereford, i. 131, 132, 156, 379.
 Hansard, Rev. Septimus, i. 246-247.
 Harcourt, Sir Wm., ii. 213, 234.
 Hardy, Mr. Gathorne, ii. 119, 120.
 Harrison, Archdeacon, ii. 406 *n.*
 Harrowby, Lord, ii. 42, 387, 388.
 Harviestoun, i. 6, 7, 12, 47 ; ii. 322.
 Hassard, Sir J., i. 274 ; ii. 419, 587.
 Hatcham Case (*see* Tooth).
 Hatherley, Lord, ii. 90, 93 *n.*
 Heathcote, Sir W., i. 195 ; ii. 380.
 Herbert, i. 40.
 Heywood, Mr., i. 156.
 Hinds, S., Bishop of Norwich, i. 159.
 Holden, Dr., i. 40.
 Holt, Mr., M.P., ii. 206.
 Hook, Dr. W. F., Dean of Chichester, i. 200, 472, 538 ; ii. 59, 524.
 Hooker, Sir W., i. 40.
 Hope, Lord President, i. 31.
 Hope, Mr. Beresford, M.P., i. 410, 420 ; ii. 193, 269 *n.*, 406 *n.*
 Horner, Leonard, i. 20, 21, 38, 39.
 Houghton, Lord, i. 323 ; ii. 234.
 How, Walsham, Bishop of Wakefield, ii. 129 *n.*
- Hubbard, J. G., Lord Addington, i. 410, 422, 423, 425, 430.
 Hughes, Thomas, i. 230 ; ii. 519, 545.
 Hyacinthe, Père, ii. 527, 547.
- IGNATIUS, FATHER (*see* Lyne, J. L.).
 Illinois, Bishop of (Dr. Whitehouse), i. 378.
 Inglis, Sir Robert, i. 156.
 Intercession for Missions, Annual Day of, ii. 359.
 Irish Church Disestablishment, ii. 1-43, 493.
 Irvingism, i. 531.
 Islington Church-building, i. 252.
- JACKSON, J., Bishop of Lincoln and of London, i. 205 *n.*, 360, 381 ; ii. 93 *n.*, 207 *n.*, 335, 353, 474, 479.
 Jackson, Thomas, i. 45 *n.*
 James I., grave of, i. 1.
 Japan Bishopric, ii. 588.
 Jeffrey, Francis, i. 13, 21.
 Jenkyns, Dr., Master of Balliol, i. 33, 34, 39.
 Jeune, Dr., Bishop of Peterborough, i. 159, 378.
John Bull, The, i. 445.
 Jones, Bence, i. 40.
 Jones, Bishop of Capetown, ii. 339.
 Johnson, Rev. G. H. S., Dean of Wells, i. 46, 59, 159 and *n.* ; ii. 290, 543, 582.
 Jowett, B., Master of Balliol, i. 40, 57, 107, 199, 277, 278, 280 ; ii. 108, 430, 606.
 Joyce, Prebendary, ii. 205.
- KEBLE, JOHN, i. 52, 352.
 Kennion, G. W., Bishop of Adelaide, ii. 595.
 Kerfoot, Bishop, ii. 362.
 Kersley, James, ii. 595.
 King, Canon, now Bishop of Lincoln, ii. 424, 524.
 King, Rev. Bryan, i. 230-248.

- Kinnaird, Mr. Arthur, i. 263.
 Knight, Rev. W., i. 208.
 Knollys, Rev. W. F. E., ii. 50, 332, 593.
- LADIES', LONDON DIOCESAN ASSOCIATION, i. 448.
- Lake, W. C., Dean of Durham, i. 40, 57, 63, 69, 71, 102, 111, 128, 137; ii. 424, 595, 603.
- Lambeth, i. 42; ii. 599.
- Lambeth Conference, First, i. 374 ff; Second, ii. 329, 362-377.
- Lancaster, Mrs., i. 451, 471.
- Lansdowne, Marquis of, i. 31.
- Lawrence, Lord, i. 50.
- Lectionary, New, Bill, ii. 102 n., 130.
- Lee, Dr. Prince, Bishop of Manchester, i. 156, 378.
- Lee, Rev. F. G., i. 242.
- Lichfield, Bishop of (*see* Maclagan).
- Liddell, Rev. H. G., Dean of Christchurch, i. 159.
- Liddell, Hon. and Rev. Robert, i. 216.
- Liddon, H. P., Canon of St. Paul's, ii. 90, 137-139, 144, 146, 224 n., 424 n.
- Lightfoot, J. B., i. 207, 338, 473, 478, 537; ii. 132, 134; Bishop of Durham, ii. 353, 517.
- Lincoln, Bishop of (*see* Jackson; Wordsworth).
- Lingen, R. (Lord), i. 199.
- Lipscombe, G., ii. 556.
- London, Bishop of (*see* Blomfield; Jackson).
- London, See of, proposed Division, i. 201.
- Long v. Bishop of Capetown, i. 350.
- Longley, C. T., Bishop of Ripon and of Durham, Archbishop of York and of Canterbury, i. 206, 270, 273, 339, 354, 363, 374, 375, 377, 384, 391, 401, 407, 408, 534; ii. 3, 381.
- Longside, home of the Tait Family, i. 2, 3.
- Lonsdale, James, i. 40, 57.
- Lowder, Rev. Charles F., i. 229, 230, 248, 437, 438, 470; ii. 263.
- Lowe, Robert, Lord Sherbrooke, i. 45, 46, 68, 85.
- Luscombe, Bishop, ii. 348.
- Lushington, Dr., i. 132, 133, 312.
- Lyne, Rev. J. L., i. 502, 505.
- Lyttelton, Lord, ii. 54, 318.
- M'DOUGALL, BISHOP, i. 327 n., 334; ii. 97.
- M'Irvine, Bishop of Ohio, ii. 109, 505.
- Mackarness, J. F., Bishop of Oxford, ii. 58.
- Mackenzie, John Morell, i. 31 n., 53.
- MacKnight, Dr. Thomas, i. 11.
- Mackonochie, Rev. A. H., i. 244, 422, 424, 427, 434, 436, 540; ii. 420, 422, 474-480, 606.
- Maclagan, W. D., Bishop of Lichfield, ii. 260, 411, 594.
- Macrorie, Rev. W. K., Bishop of Maritzburg, i. 383, 385, 395; ii. 319.
- Madagascar Mission, ii. 341-349.
- Magee, W. C., Bishop of Peterborough, i. 536; ii. 31, 32, 41, 42, 140-142, 207 and n., 222, 387, 402, 403, 451.
- Manchester, Bishop of (*see* Lee; Fraser).
- Manning (afterwards Archbishop and Cardinal), i. 39; ii. 47.
- Mark's, St., Training College, i. 100.
- Marlborough, Duke of, ii. 32.
- Marriott, Charles, i. 40.
- Marsh Baldon, i. 58, 60; ii. 108.
- Marsh, Miss, i. 471.
- Marten, Mr., M.P., ii. 390.
- Martin, John, i. 428; ii. 422.
- Martin v. Mackonochie, i. 429, 435.
- Martin's League, St., ii. 483-485, 546.
- Matthias, St., Stoke Newington, i. 436.
- Maule, Mr. Justice, i. 211.

- Maurice, Rev. F. D., i. 164, 230, 274, 355, 396, 510-516, 537, 580.
 Memorial Meeting, ii. 599.
 Merivale, Herman, i. 39.
 Michael's, St., Shoreditch, i. 439 ff., 483.
 Mill, J. S., ii. 303, 304.
 Mills, Professor, i. 40.
 Milman, Dean, i. 35, 259, 525.
 Migherditch, Archbishop, ii. 521.
 Mitchinson, Bishop of Barbados, ii. 376.
 Moberly, Geo. H., Bishop of Salisbury, i. 38, 39, 57; ii. 47, 64, 155, 169, 179, 207 n., 271.
 Monsell, Harriet, i. 450; ii. 275, 413.
 Moody and Sankey, ii. 507-510.
 Moore, George, i. 187.
 Morgan, Osborne, M.P., ii. 380, 382, 391, 403, 404.
 Morley, Samuel, ii. 107, 109, 601.
 Morton, Betty, i. 13, 14, 22, 26, 35, 50, 51, 200.
 Mount-Edgcombe, Earl of, ii. 401.
 Mozley, T. R., i. 75, 105; ii. 320, 321, 332, 550, 594.
 Murdoch, Charles, wife of John Tait, i. 4.
 Music, Royal College of, speech for, ii. 499-500.
- NELSON, LORD, ii. 31, 202, 343.
 Nestorians, Mission to, ii. 519.
 Newman, J. H., afterwards Cardinal, i. 43, 52, 55, 63, 65, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 83, 89, 105.
 Nonconformists, relations with, i. 60, 254; ii. 499, 502-515, 530, 539, 601.
 Northcote, Sir Stafford, i. 40, 107.
 Norwich, Bishop of (*see* Hinds, S.).
- OAKELEY, REV. F. (Tutor of Balliol), i. 42, 43, 53, 57, 59, 61, 62, 74, 77, 85, 99, 106, 416, 417, 509, 538; ii. 108, 525.
 Ogilvie, Canon, i. 42, 491; ii. 132, n.
- 'Old Catholic' Movement, ii. 82-85, 514, 515.
 Open-Air Preaching, i. 255, 498.
 'Ornaments' Rubric, ii. 415, 418.
 Orphanage, Mrs. Tait's, i. 471; ii. 103, 107, 336, 429, 549.
 Otford, ii. 520.
 Oxford, Bishop of (*see* Bagot; Wilberforce; Mackarness).
 Oxford University Commission, i. 156, 159, 160-174; its Report, i. 165.
- PAGE, DR., i. 182, 186.
 Page, H. S. (*see* Selfe, Henry).
 Palmer, Sir Roundell, Lord Selborne, i. 44, 45 n., 47, 156, 157; ii. 117, 208, 210, 232, 391, 393, 441, 442, 444.
 Palmer, William, of Magdalen, i. 85, 89.
 Palmer, William (of Worcester), i. 85.
 Palmerston, Lord, i. 187, 191, 270.
 Pan-Anglican Synod (*see* Lambeth Conference).
 Papal Aggression, i. 183, 215.
 Park Place, Edinburgh, i. 5, 36, 51, 377; ii. 47.
 Parry, Rev. E., i. 208; Archdeacon of Canterbury, and Bishop Suffragan of Dover, ii. 49, 51, 56, 229, 335, 589, 593.
 Patrizi, Cardinal, i. 484.
 Pattison, Mark, i. 105.
 Paul's Cathedral, St., Evening Services at, i. 259.
 Payne, i. 40.
 Pearson, Hugh, i. 57.
 Pégomas, ii. 546, 587.
 Pelham, Bishop, i. 193.
 Penzance, Lord, ii. 238.
 Perceval, Dudley, i. 173.
 Percy, Bishop of Carlisle, i. 186.
 Perry, Bishop, ii. 426 n.
 Peter's, St., London Docks (*see* Lowder).
 Peterborough, Bishop of (*see* Jeune; Magee).
 Peto, Sir Morton, ii. 378.

Phillimore, Sir Robert, i. 410; ii. 90, 92.
 Phillpotts, H., Bishop of Exeter, i. 99, 161 *n.*, 196, 378.
 Poole, Rev. A., i. 223-225.
 Portal, Mr. G., i. 173.
 Powell, Professor Baden, i. 159, 278.
 Pressensé, M., ii. 515, 528.
 Price, Bonamy, i. 111.
Priest in Absolution, The, ii. 171-175.
 Protestant Alliance, i. 183.
 "Provincial Dean," Office of, i. 527-529.
 Public Worship Regulation Act, ii. 114, 170 *n.*, 186-235, 447, 604.
 Pugh, Rev. J. W., i. 40, 61.
Punch, Cartoons in, ii. 37, 574.
 'Purchas Case,' *The*, ii. 92-100.
 Pusey, Dr., i. 76, 85, 249, 314, 337, 398; ii. 59, 90, 133, 144, 146, 149, 152, 156, 158, 161, 180, 194, 267, 291.
 QUEEN, HER MAJESTY THE, i. 206; ii. 8, 22, 23, 25-27, 34, 35, 39, 42, 233, 321, 335, 517, 540, 550, 596, 598.
 'RAMBLER' SOCIETY, i. 45 and *n.*
 Ramshorn Church, Glasgow (St. David's), i. 37; ii. 592.
 Ranavalona, Queen of Madagascar, ii. 341.
Record, The, i. 209, 318, 319, 440; ii. 229, 271, 561.
 Redesdale, Lord, ii. 171.
 "Reformed Episcopal Church," ii. 512-514.
 Renan, M., *fl.* 304.
 Renishaw, i. 14, 34, 40; ii. 530, 533.
 Resignation of Benefices Act, ii. 102 *n.*
 Revision of A. V. Committee, ii. 63-74.
 Richards, Rev. Upton, i. 417.
 Richmond, Duke of, ii. 32, 234, 385.
 Richmond, G., R.A., ii. 519.
 Riddell, James, i. 40.
 Ridsdale, Rev. C. J., ii. 236-245, 281, 287, 292.
 Ritual Question, i. 398-441; ii. 413-

453. (*See also* Stuart, Green, Bodington, Tooth, Mackonochie, Dale, Enraght.)
 Ritual, Royal Commission on, i. 407-412; First Report, i. 410; Second Report, i. 413; Fourth Report, ii. 127, 451.
 Rochester, Bishop of (*see* Claughton; Thorold).
 Rogers, Rev. W., i. 532.
 Romilly, Lord, i. 368.
 Russell, Lord John, i. 131, 137, 149, 155, 156, 157, 162, 187; ii. 32.
 Ryan, Bishop of Mauritius, ii. 341-4.
 SAINT, REV. J. F., ii. 61.
 Salisbury, Bishop of (*see* Hamilton; Moberly).
 — Marquis of, ii. 19, 31, 32, 41, 118, 123, 156, 193, 210, 211, 213, 219, 221 *n.*, 386, 448, 471.
 Salvation Army, ii. 510-512.
 Salt, Joseph, i. 40.
 Sandford, Archdeacon, ii. 124.
 — Charles W., Bishop of Gibraltar, ii. 612.
 — Daniel, Bishop of Edinburgh, i. 36.
 — Mr. (afterwards Sir Daniel), i. 26, 31, 64, 65.
 Sandon, Lord, ii. 105.
 Scott, Rev. Robert, i. 45 *n.*, 73, 90.
 Scott, Sir Walter, i. 18, 21.
 Seabury, Bishop, ii. 345.
 Seaton, i. 46.
 Selborne, Lord (*see* Palmer, Sir R.).
 Selfe, Henry Page, i. 26, 30, 535.
 Sellon, Miss, i. 450, 470.
 Selwyn, G. A., Bishop of New Zealand, afterwards of Lichfield, i. 379; ii. 54, 80, 179, 258, 260, 325, 343, 362, 368, 495.
 — Professor, ii. 132.
 Sewell, William, i. 53, 85.
 Shaftesbury, Earl of, i. 50, 183, 187, 193, 208, 209, 255, 263, 398, 407, 408, 410; ii. 34, 59, 105, 110-113, 153, 166, 188, 193, 196 *n.*, 197, 208-211, 215, 345, 601.

- Shairp, Principal, i. 21, 52, 71, 76, 84, 105, 118.
- Sherbrooke, Lord (*see* Lowe, Robt.).
- "Shortened Services" Act, ii. 109.
- Shuttleworth, P., afterwards Bishop of Chichester, i. 40.
- Sisterhoods, Church of England, i. 449-469.
- Sitwell, Lady, i. 8, 13, 14, 34; ii. 530.
- Sir G., i. 14.
- Skinner, Rev. John, i. 3.
- Smith, Archibald (of Jordan Hill), i. 31.
- Dr. Vance, ii. 63-67.
- Goldwin, i. 158, 159.
- Snell Exhibition, i. 32 and *n.*
- Dinner at Balliol, ii. 108.
- Sommer, Professor, i. 70.
- S.P.G., i. 380; ii. 343, 346, 537.
- "Speaker's Commentary," i. 523-527.
- Spiller, C. C., i. 426.
- Spooner, Archdeacon, i. 122.
- Catharine (*see* Tait, Catharine).
- Stanhope, Lord, ii. 19, 32, 34, 36, 42, 131, 207 *n.*
- Stanley, A. P., Canon of Canterbury, Dean of Westminster, i. 1, 40, 45 *n.*, 57, 69, 71, 92, 97, 107, 112, 113, 114, 129, 159, 165, 198, 207, 208, 230, 284, 286, 308, 310, 346, 410, 491, 512, 516, 525, 537; ii. 74, 136, 145, 157, 161, 317, 417, 428, 537, 541, 606.
- Stonehouse, i. 534.
- Stratford de Redcliffe, Lord, ii. 569-571.
- Stuart, Rev. E., i. 219.
- Stubbs, Canon, now Bishop of Oxford, ii. 424 *n.*
- Subscription, Clerical, i. 487-495.
- Succoth, Lord (*see* Campbell, Sir Ilay).
- Suffragan Bishops, ii. 47, 53-56.
- Sumner, C. R., Bishop of Winchester, i. 43, 380.
- Canon, ii. 406.
- Sumner, J. B., Archbishop of Canterbury, i. 165, 205 *n.*, 270, 272, 282.
- Sunday Labour, i. 264.
- "Supernatural Religion," ii. 302, 306.
- Swainson, Professor, ii. 132.
- Swinton, Archibald, i. 30, 41, 65.
- TAIT, A. C., Note C., 610.
- William, of Ludquharn (great-great-grandfather of Archbishop Tait), i. 2.
- Thomas (son of William Tait and great-grandfather of Archbishop Tait), i. 2, 4.
- John (son of Thomas Tait and grandfather of Archbishop Tait), i. 4, 5.
- Craufurd (son of John Tait and father of Archbishop Tait), i. 4, 5, 6, 8, 27, 47, 49.
- Ilay Campbell (brother of Archbishop Tait), i. 8 *n.*, 19.
- Susan Murray (sister of Archbishop Tait). *See* Lady Sitwell.
- Anna Mary (sister of Archbishop Tait, afterwards Mrs. Wildman), i. 8 *n.*
- Thomas Forsyth (brother of Archbishop Tait), i. 8 *n.*, 48.
- James Campbell (brother of Archbishop Tait), i. 8 *n.*, 17, 19, 48; ii. 516.
- Craufurd (brother of Archbishop Tait), i. 8 *n.*, 48.
- John (brother of Archbishop Tait) i. 8 *n.*; ii. 322.
- Charlotte Murdoch (sister of Archbishop Tait). *See* Lady Wake.
- Catharine (wife of Archbishop Tait), i. 122, 135, 154, 160, 161, 185; ii. 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 87, 107, 333-335, 428.
- Catherine Anna (daughter of A. C. Tait), i. 154 *n.*
- Mary Susan (daughter of A. C. Tait), i. 154 *n.*