

THE MONTH.

CONVOCA**T**ION of Canterbury opened on the 7th. In discussing a Report on the relations of Church and State which came up from the Lower House in 1879, the Bishop of Peterborough moved a resolution, carried unanimously, requesting his Grace the Primate to move for a Royal Commission to inquire into the laws ecclesiastical and the constitution of the Ecclesiastical Courts. The Bishop of Bath and Wells remarked that although their Lordships asked for an inquiry respecting the Ecclesiastical Courts, they did not, it should be understood, express any dissatisfaction with the decisions of these Courts. The Archbishop expressed himself as exceedingly pleased that the Bishop of Bath and Wells had brought out the fact, which might have been overlooked, that their Lordships had no dissatisfaction with the Court of Appeal:—

It should be borne in mind, moreover, that formerly the Court approved itself even to the very persons who now found fault with it. He was glad that it had been distinctly laid down that their Lordships did not in any way join in the senseless clamour which had been raised against the Court of Appeal. . . . It would be distinctly laid down by those who moved for the Royal Commission that their Lordships were firmly and devotedly attached to the great principles of the Reformation as embodied in the statutes relating to the supremacy of the Crown and the good government of the National Church. In this age of great anxieties, when some people were wildly calling for changes, it would do an infinity of mischief if it were supposed that the fathers of the Church were swerving from the great constitutional principles upon which the Church rested. In a conference with the Bishops of the Northern Province on the previous day upon this point (twenty-six bishops being here present),¹ agreement had been given to the course which it was now proposed to adopt. The information which the Royal Commission could give would enable them to build up the peace and usefulness of the Church so as to hand it down unimpaired to future generations.²

¹ The Bishop of Carlisle, in a Pastoral Letter, says:—"If any measure can be devised and introduced into Parliament by means of which future scandals can be prevented, and discipline enforced without violence to person or liberty, it shall have such support as I can give it. At the same time, I cannot conceal from myself that there must be some method of enforcing discipline, whatever it may be. I confess that I should have thought the old-fashioned method of enforcing discipline, of which we have the scheme in the Ordination Service—obedience to the Ordinary, following with a glad mind and will his godly admonitions, and submitting to his godly judgment—was by far the best method, and the only one likely to bring back permanent peace to the Church."

² The Bishop of Lincoln's resolution, amended, finally adopted by their Lordships, runs thus:—

"That this House, having taken into consideration the petitions and

In the Lower House, a Motion, "an expression of conciliation," was brought forward by Canon Gregory. The Dean of Llandaff (Dr. Vaughan) held that the Motion asked that a dispensing power should be given to the bishops, and that that for the time being should be the law of the Church:—

This he considered a most mistaken direction. His own humble opinion of the best remedy was to be found in the following amendment, which he begged to move:—"That this House, by recognizing to the full the right of every clergyman to promote by all constitutional means the adoption of any changes in the law of the Church which he may think expedient, yet desires to record its opinion that it is a primary duty that the ministers of the Church, pending the introduction of such changes, should set an example of ready obedience to the admonitions of their ecclesiastical superiors and the decisions of the existing tribunals."

The Dean of Salisbury seconded the Amendment. The Motion asked bishops to do what lay in their power already, for it had been decided that there was a vast discretion resident in the bishops. Canon Bernard said that the practical effect of any action the House might take on the Motion would be very serious. The effect on the public mind would be an impression that the House had practically adopted the innovations which had been creeping in the Church, and that thereby a fresh step had been taken in the direction of the Roman communion, and a considerable step in the direction of alienation from the surrounding mass of nonconforming Christians. The Dean of Peterborough heartily supported the Amendment. His opinion was that the *gravamen* meant that a clergyman was to decide for himself what law he was to obey. As to the Ritualists and their appeals to conscience he must observe that there was such a thing as a wrongly-trained and perverted conscience. As to the charge of Romanizing there were grounds for it. Archdeacon Kaye supported the Amendment. Ultimately, the *gravamen*¹ of

memorials brought before it by his Grace the President, and also the *articulus cleri* presented to it by the Lower House, is of opinion that litigation in matters of ritual is to be deprecated and deplored, and if possible to be avoided. It also declares that authority to settle differences in such matters is adherent in the Episcopal office, as witnessed by ancient practice, and as referred to in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer; and while this House entertains the hope that the clergy, as in duty bound, will, in conjunction with the laity, support the legitimate exercise of this authority, it also expresses its confidence that this authority will be exercised by the Bishops of this Province, in their respective dioceses, with an earnest endeavour to compose such differences without litigation, and at the same time to maintain order, decency, purity of doctrine, and edification in divine worship."

¹"*Reformandum*—The House therefore prays that your Lordships, having regard to the uncertainties which have been widely thought to surround some recent interpretations of ecclesiastical law, as well as the

Canon Gregory which began with the statement that "during the last half-century there has been a great outburst of life in the Church of England," and which seemed, as Sir James Philipps, and several speakers, pointed out, to assert that the zeal was all on the side of the Ritualists, was carried. Dean Vaughan's Amendment was rejected by 65 to 20 votes.¹

Several letters have been published in *The Times* concerning "Doctrine and Ritual." The Dean of Chester wrote:—"The contention that the expression of doctrine by change of ritual is as allowable in a regularly constituted Church as its expression in the pulpit is so astounding, and it is so obvious that by the method of persevering and progressive changes of ritual a doctrinal revolution in the Church of England might be silently affected, that public attention ought to be directed as carefully as possible to this precise point of the question" recently raised. Dr. Howson quoted two authorities, one on the ecclesiastical, and

peculiar character of parishes and congregations placed in the most dissimilar religious circumstances, would discountenance, as far as possible, legal proceedings in these matters. In making this request the House feels that this forbearance must be conditioned by limitations. It prefers, however, to remit the consideration of those limitations to your Lordships assembled in this solemn synod under the guidance of the Holy Spirit."

¹ Archdeacon Allen had moved "the previous question," as he thought it undesirable to adopt any strong expression of opinion in favour of connivance with breaches of the law, or to make a show of dictating to the bishops. Dean Stanley, in seconding the previous question, objected to the assumption that all the energy in the Church was on one side. He always had combated that notion, and always would do so. Long before the appearance of the "Tracts for the Times" the activity, energy, and devotion of members of the Church of England was fully known to all the world, and the assumption was all the more ungenerous as their Evangelical brethren were very little represented in that House. (Hear, hear.) He had said before, and he must now repeat it, that this was merely a question of clergymen's clothes. (Oh, oh.) One of the vestments so clung to as representing doctrine was the chasuble, and, as everybody knew, it was unknown to the Church until the 9th century, and it was first worn as an outdoor garment of the clergy, and of the peasantry, on rainy days. ("Oh, oh," and laughter.) The Dean of Llandaff (Dr. Vaughan) said:—"Ample justice has been done to the persons whom, I suppose, it is not disrespectful to call Ritualists. If the term were disrespectful I would not use it; for I know and respect many members of that body. But I wish equal justice had also been done to the minor nonconformities (if such there have been) of a body which is in a great minority in this House—which, in fact, so far as their representation in this place is concerned, I might almost call the extinct Evangelical party. (Cheers and a laugh.) I wish that equal justice had always been done to the greater nonconformities which are avowedly without the pale of the Church of England. That we live in an important crisis I do not dispute. A great wave of lawlessness has been sweeping over Europe. (Cheers.) We have seen it in France. We have seen it in Russia. We have seen it in Ireland. "Etiam in senatum venit; etiam in ecclesiam!"

the other on the legal side of the subject, which taken together leave very little more to be said regarding it. Bishop Wilberforce speaking in Convocation in the year 1868, used the following words :—

I do not hold that the liberty of introducing unusual Rites into the Church stands in the least on the same footing as the liberty of preaching Doctrine. Now, that is an important distinction, and one which the persons concerned seem to me to forget. When a Ritual long established and standing on the *mos pro lege* principle, is altered in a Church, it is not only that the man who does it advances his views as a teacher of the Church, but, taking advantage of his position to make actual manual alterations in the Services, he makes all the congregation of the Church who acquiesce in those alterations parties with him in his particular view. And there must be a distinction between the larger licence given in Preaching and the smaller licence given in any alterations of an existing Ritual.

The other quotation given by the Dean is from the Bennett judgment :—

If the minister be allowed to introduce at his own will variations in the Rites and Ceremonies that seem to him to interpret the doctrine of the Service in a particular direction, the service ceases to be what it was meant to be—common ground upon which all Church-people may meet, though they differ about some doctrines. But the Church of England has wisely left a certain latitude of opinion in matters of belief, and has not insisted on a uniformity of thought, which might reduce her communion to a narrow compass.

Remarks on the memorial for “Toleration” have been published by the Dean of Chichester, in the form of a Letter¹ to the

¹ We quote a few paragraphs from this very valuable letter. The Dean says:—6. “It would have greatly simplified the issue which has been thus raised, if the framers of the present Memorial had been so obliging as to state which precisely are the concessions they expect to obtain at the hands of the Bishops. For they cannot seriously suppose that indiscriminate license is henceforth to become the law of the Church; or that, simply in order to facilitate ‘Ritualistic’ irregularities, the Sectarian principle of mere Congregationalism is going to be recognized to the prejudice of our ancient Parochial system. It is also to be hoped that the originators of the document under consideration will in due time have the manliness to come forward openly, and explain *why* they are so strenuously bent on obtaining these concessions. There should be throughout this matter the utmost openness and candour on both sides. 7. I will set the Memorialists an example of candour by plainly avowing that the reason why I regard the demands of the (so called) ‘Ritualists’ with utter disfavour, is because I find it impossible to divest myself of the conviction that what the leaders of the party in reality aim at is the introduction into our Reformed Church of England of something undistinguishable from the Romish Mass. 8. That the plain letter of our Articles and Formularies is irreconcilable with such an attempt, we are well aware. And so are they. But then they also know (and so do we) that a ceremonial closely assimilated to that of Rome; that vestments and

Primate. At the outset the Dean points out that the Memorial is ambiguous :

It asks for a "policy of toleration and forbearance" on the part of our ecclesiastical superiors in dealing with questions of Ritual. But surely such a policy has prevailed for a long time past,—is prevailing to an extraordinary extent *now*. We could all indicate Churches (not a few) in which our reformed Ritual is scarcely any longer recognizable; but where the incumbent pursues his self-willed course undisturbed. In fact the amount of indulgence at this time accorded to those of the clergy who (in the words of the late Bishop Wilberforce) exhibit "a fidgetty anxiety to make everything in their Churches assimilate to foreign usage," provokes general astonishment. It cannot therefore be a large measure of charitable forbearance, or even of indulgent allowance, which is pleaded for by your Memorialists, for that is enjoyed already.¹

The Counter Memorial forwarded by Bishop Perry to his Grace the Primate, on the 1st, was signed by nine Deans, and by a large number of representative dignitaries, including Professors Swainson and Lumby, Dr. Corrie, and Professor Pritchard.²

The *National Church*, an ably edited and interesting periodical, has some sensible observations on the present position of the Tithe Question, a question which in one way or other is surely

other 'ornaments;' that postures, gestures, phraseology, music, hymns and accessories of whatever kind, freely adopted from the practice of the same corrupt Communion;—that these will go a long way towards overcoming any obstacles presented by our Book of Common Prayer. Inconvenient expressions in the Communion Office can always be (as they actually are) omitted, or else rendered unintelligible by the celebrant. With the aid of a highly ornate ceremonial, it would in fact be quite easy to evacuate the Reformed Rite of its doctrinal significance; and to make it undistinguishable from the Mass."

¹ No particulars were mentioned, we may remark, in the plea for toleration. The *Guardian*, in a hesitating way, had suggested that the cope might be permitted; but as Dr. Blakeney has pointed out in his valuable work on the Prayer Book, the cope is not a sacerdotal garment.

² Referring to the Memorial drawn up by Dean Church, the Memorialists say:—

"We have no desire to narrow the comprehensiveness of the National Church, or to abridge that reasonable liberty which has always been conceded to Churchmen in matters non-essential. We are, however, firmly convinced that neither in Public Prayer, nor in administration of the Sacraments, ought there to be granted any toleration of the use of vestments and symbols avowedly reintroduced as exponents of doctrines which we believe to be unscriptural, and which have been declared to be not in accordance with the plain intention of the Articles and Formularies of the Church of England.

"We therefore respectfully but firmly entreat your Grace 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."

coming to the front. The article in the *National Church* thus concludes:—

The remedy for a state of things which is vexatious to the farmer and not advantageous to the owner of the rent-charge, is a short and simple one, capable of being passed through Parliament even in so busy a session as the present. Let the owners of the tithe rent-charge join hands with the tenant-farmers. Let the irritating and costly system of collecting the rent-charge from the tenants be abolished, as it has been in Ireland (2 & 3 Wm. IV., c. 119, and 3 & 4 Wm. IV., c. 100), as it has been in Scotland (Stats. 1663, c. 17; 1690, c. 23), as it is on many estates in England. Let the rent-charge be demandable from the landowner, or, if in any case it be paid by the tenant, let him be empowered to deduct it in full from his rent. Secondly, let a further sacrifice be conceded by the owners of the rent-charge for the sake of peace and simplicity. Let the system of the septennial averages be abolished, and let the average value in money of the rent-charge since the year 1836 be made a fixed and permanent charge on the land.

The publication of the secret correspondence between the Russian authorities and Shere Ali, found in Cabul, will serve, to some extent, as a vindication of Lord Lytton's invasion of Afghanistan.¹

The case of *Jones v. Stannard*, argued at considerable length before Vice-Chancellor Hall, shows how a Congregationalist may appeal to Trust Deeds, against Minister and Trustees, with success. The discussion of spiritual matters in secular courts is sometimes unavoidable; and the ultra-Churchmen who are clamouring for disestablishment under the delusion, that, as "Free Churchmen," they must be free from State Control, will read, we hope, the report of the Huddersfield Chapel case. It may here be remarked that at the opening of Convocation the Archbishop referred to the clerical cry for freedom from civil control:—

He could not help calling to mind that at a Church Congress one of their brethren, an African Bishop, at Croydon, rose and thanked God

¹ One passage in a letter from General Stolitieff runs thus: "Now, my kind friend, I inform you that the enemy of your famous religion wants to make peace with you through the Kaisar (Sultan) of Turkey. *Therefore you should look to your brothers who live on the other side of the river.* If God stirs them up, and gives the sword of fight into their hands, then go on in the name of GOD (Bismilla); otherwise you should be as a serpent; *make peace openly and in secret prepare for war;* and when God reveals his order to you, declare yourself. It will be well when the envoy of your enemy wants to enter the country if you *send an able emissary, possessing the tongue of a serpent and full of deceit,* to the enemy's country, so that he may, with sweet words, perplex the enemy's mind, and induce him to give up the intention of fighting with you. My kind friend, I entrust you to the protection of GOD. May GOD be the protector of the Ameer's kingdom, and may trembling fall upon the limbs of your enemies. Amen."

that he was entirely free from any jurisdiction of the civil power. Now, his Grace's table was laden with papers with reference to this very Bishop. He was denied entrance to his own cathedral; his power of suspending any one from office had been denied; and it appeared that the only remedy that Bishop had was by appeal to the civil power.

Thomas Carlyle has passed away in his 86th year.

A deplorable war has broken out in the Transvaal; and the rebellious Boers at the outset gained considerable advantages.

The proceedings at the opening of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, were most auspicious. The Vice-Chancellor (Dr. Perowne, Master of Corpus) presided, and three of the four Divinity Professors were present.¹ The sermon was preached by the Rev. Sir Emilius Bayley.

Several letters have appeared in the leading journal concerning the "minor nonconformities" of the Evangelical section of the clergy; to an admirable letter from the veteran Dr. Close we hope hereafter to call attention.

On the 2nd, the Speaker, from the very necessity of the case, making a precedent for the House of Commons, closed a sitting which had been vexatiously prolonged for more than forty-one hours. The Home Rulers, growing wild in lawlessness from impunity, had become more and more offensive in their obstruction as well as defiant in their language. Acting, as he afterwards stated, upon his own responsibility and from a sense of duty to the House, the Speaker summarily closed, at nine o'clock on Wednesday morning, a debate which had commenced on Monday afternoon at four. On the following day, at an evening sitting, 36 Home Rulers were suspended.

The Coercion Bill has not yet (19th) passed through Committee. The Obstructionist Irish Members gave indications that they were beginning to recover from the effect of the Speaker's *coup d'état*, and the Government have accordingly suggested regulations still more stringent.

¹ The fourth Divinity Professor, Dr. Lumby, was detained, according to a correspondent of the *Record*, but he is known to be friendly to the Hall. The correspondent mentions an interesting fact in regard to religious life in Cambridge. A special service was held in Trinity, for servants. "There was a congregation of at least 400 persons, of whom fully 300 were in the employ of the college in its many departments of work. The Precentor read the service, the Deans the lessons, the Regius Professor of Divinity was present, and the sermon was preached by one of the Fellows. A noble and profitable anthem (Wesley's "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord") was beautifully sung by the choir, who gladly volunteered help."