

Him "in Whose hands are both we and our words" (Wisdom, vii. 16).

In this simple, sensible, pious strain the venerable Bishop of Hippo gave his advice to those who would hear, all those centuries ago. If he has not much that is new to tell to this century on this well-worn subject, neither should we have many new discoveries to reveal to him. It is sufficient for us, and restful to our minds, to observe that there is not a discordant note between us. He has no thought or desire in preaching but to exalt the Word of God; so to handle it as to make it clear to the people; and so to impress it, that they may obey its precepts and accept its teaching. No false doctrine can obtain permanent lodgment in a Church which follows this rule in its pulpits. The saddest sign in our day is the frequent poverty of Scripture preaching, and, too often, its almost utter absence. The cessation from controversy which some crave may be only the stillness of death. If it be the desire of the soul to cease from human war-cries and vexatious bickerings, that it may listen in quietness to the voice of God, there is life in that silence. Some of us would do well to come apart and rest awhile from conflict in that spiritual audience-chamber. So replied Latimer to the scholastic teachers from whom, in middle life, he was escaping. "It is enough for me that Christ's sheep hear no man's voice but Christ's. As for you, ye have no voice of Christ against me, whereas, for my part, I have a heart that is ready to hearken to any voice of Christ that you can bring me. So, fare you well, and trouble me no more from the talking with the Lord my God."

He who has thus "talked with the Lord his God" is the preacher that Latimer was to his own people. He is the preacher Augustine has described. He is the preacher for whom our own age is waiting.

T. P. BOULTBEE.



#### ART. IV.—LIFE OF BISHOP WILBERFORCE. VOL. III.

*Life of the Right Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford, and afterwards of Winchester.* With Selections from his Diaries and Correspondence; by his Son, REGINALD G. WILBERFORCE. Vol. iii. pp. 480. John Murray.

**W**HATEVER else may be said about the concluding volume of Bishop Wilberforce's "Life," this, at least, will be admitted on all sides—it is interesting in the extreme. The period which its narratives cover—from 1861 to 1873—was

one of singular interest; and not a few of its events will probably prove of profound importance in political, as well as in ecclesiastical circles. During this period the Bishop was a conspicuous power: he went everywhere and knew everyone; a man of winning ways, of steadfast purpose and untiring energy, with many attractive qualities, who was always ready to speak upon any subject, and was able to adapt himself to any audience—the brilliant Bishop naturally showed himself a leader. According to his son, indeed, his place upon the Episcopal Bench, in regard to influence, was the highest.

The first volume of the "Life," says Mr. Reginald Wilberforce in his preface, described the preparation for the Bishop's work; the second, the period of struggle; and the concluding volume is "an attempt to portray him as he was during the last ten years of his life—the 'undisputed leader among the English Bishops.' The effort in Convocation to obtain a Synodical condemnation of 'Essays and Reviews'—a result obtained at first only by the casting-vote of the venerable Archbishop—shows how divided were the counsels of the Episcopate; and the man, therefore, who could and did reconcile these conflicting counsels into unanimity, stepped, by so doing, into the position of actual, though not of nominal, leader. Again, in the troubles concerning Dr. Colenso, it was Bishop Wilberforce who penned the address signed by forty-one Bishops. In the Pan-Anglican Synod the pastoral letter which was agreed upon was his work. The first report of the Ritual Commission was drawn up by him; and the skill with which he averted restrictive legislation in 1867, when nearly the whole Bench of Bishops were in favour of a measure of the kind, explains still more clearly the ascendancy which was conceded to him by his Episcopal brethren."

"When it is further remembered," adds Mr. Wilberforce, "that in the year after he was called away the Bishops did introduce the Public Worship Regulation Act—a measure the evils of which they did not foresee—it will be felt how much the Church had been indebted to his foresight and courage."

Now, of the Bishop's "courage" there is no question; but as to his "foresight," opinions are diverse. In the first place, the Ritual Commission, of which the Bishop was a leading member, recommended legislation; "aggrieved parishioners," said its Report, should be provided with an easy and effectual process for complaint and redress. But let this pass. Mistakes, no doubt, were made, both in and out of Parliament, during the year 1874. To turn to the main question. Although the Ritualistic revolt, from one cause or another, may seem successful, it ought to be "remembered" that, not alone against the Public Worship Regulation Act has resistance been obstinate. In

Diocesan Conferences, or at the Church Congress, and in the newspapers, stress is laid upon the uncanonical character of the Public Worship Regulation Act and of its Judge; but it ought to be "remembered," that disobedience to Bishops has been just as persistent under the Church Discipline Act as under the Public Worship Regulation Act, and that Ritualistic lawlessness has flouted not only Lord Penzance but Sir Robert Phillimore. Now Sir Robert Phillimore was Judge in the Court of Arches before the Act of 1874 was even thought of; and his Canonical, Convocational, full-orbed Churchiness as Judge was never dimmed. It is convenient, no doubt, in certain circles to ignore these facts; just as it is one day to protest against Law Courts, and the next day to forget the protest and invoke their aid. One thing is certain: during the period of this third volume Ritualist lawlessness was growing; and the question is, in what way was the Bishop's "foresight" related to it?

An objection to this volume should be stated at the outset. A reviewer in the leading journal says that the volume will be read with avidity because, for one reason, it reveals the Bishop as the most entertaining of gossips, and affords the most fascinating glimpses into the personal arcana of the public life of his day. The "Greville Memoirs" were freely censured as too outspoken; but their indiscretions are almost discreet by the side of some of the extracts given from Bishop Wilberforce's diaries and correspondence. The reviewer "can only marvel at the audacity of the revelations." Similar criticisms have appeared in other journals. The *Standard*, for example, remarks: "The same inability to appreciate at its real value the contents of Bishop Wilberforce's Diary, which has led his son into publishing so much that is injurious to the writer, has prevented him, we suppose, from considering its effect on others. Yet there are several persons mentioned in the third volume who cannot, we should think, be well pleased at the freedom which has been taken with their names, or the names of their nearest relatives. We have noticed this want of proper reticence in the earlier portions of the work; we are sorry to find that there is so little improvement in the latest." Again, the *Spectator*, in a similar vein, remarks, that a book of this kind ought to be written "on the principle of not inserting anything privately said or written by any living person of a nature to give pain to that person without his full consent." The "revelations" of this volume, in fact, are both injurious to the Bishop, and exceedingly indiscreet in regard to other persons. As a biographer Mr. Wilberforce has been to his father what Mr. Froude has been to Carlyle. He does not appear to bear the consequent criticisms, however, with the

meekness exhibited by Mr. Froude. In a letter to the *Times*, replying to caustic criticisms on his work, Mr. Wilberforce says, that whereas the reviewer had mentioned its amazing indiscretion, "if you could see the materials which I have not yet published you might marvel at its amazing moderation." A letter of "this alarming character," replies the leading journal, "will give a painful sense of insecurity to many now living, as they fondly believe, in the happy enjoyment of mutual confidence. The late Prelate was an Englishman of a not uncommon sort. He talked freely and unreservedly. Having objects and work in hand, he was disposed to like those who helped him; not so well those who would not, or did not. In the *mêlée* of dinner talk, whatever hit his taste or his purpose found a ready access to his mind, and a good place in his memory—in his note-book, too, it now appears. Thence it often found its way into letters written in the gush of confidence to dear and valued friends. The Bishop was a partisan, and lived among partisans. He heard plenty of gossip, listening to it, and imbibing it, no doubt, frequently in advance of the retailers, who told a good story without any wish that it should be told again." On the whole, it must be admitted that the Bishop's diaries, notes, and confidential letters contain many inaccuracies, harsh judgments, and strong expressions, which he would himself have corrected or toned down.

The opening pages of this volume contain some touching references to the Bishop's bereavement. In July, 1861, Mrs. Sargent entered into rest. The Bishop deeply felt the loss. In his diary he notes that one of the last words of the beloved one was, "There is a glad sound of victory in Heaven." Writing to Mr. Gladstone, he says:—

We lay her remains to-morrow by her husband's and her children's, moving once again that sacred ground, of which the stirring is as if men ploughed into my heart.

Mr. Gladstone replied: "We feel very deeply with you under the laceration of spirit which Mrs. Sargent's death must have brought upon you. However bright her lot may be, you, with your immense labours, and the cravings of your mind and heart, must sorely indeed feel the privation; only we trust that in this also your Master will be enough for you."

Of the Bishop's loyal love for his wife many beautiful tokens appear in these pages. On July 6th he lost "dearest Mrs. Sargent;" in the previous month, on the 11th, his wedding-day, he had talked with her of her daughter's "wedding—as a dream when one awaketh." In December, 1862, he wrote at Farnham:—

I am strangely overset; almost expecting to find *her* coming to this bedroom in which I write, and which we occupied together. O life! O death! O blessed Will of God, to Thee I bow!

On the narratives of the Bishop's Irish tour in the autumn of 1861, we make no comment; but a passage in Lord Carlisle's<sup>1</sup> diary is worth quoting:

The Bishop preached in the Castle chapel admirably. It was on the incompleteness of everything here. I never knew him put forward more power. He preached only from notes. It was a sermon that could not leave one quite what it found one . . . He talked of the tenderness of nature he had found in Lord Aberdeen and Sir Robert Peel under cold masks. When the Bishop was much attacked about the Hampden transactions, Peel made him explain it all, then told him not to mind it. "How I have been attacked!" with much emotion.

This reference to Peel may be compared with that on page 23. Wilberforce did not reckon him "morose and sullen."

Some extracts from the Bishop's diary, pp. 33-35, afford proof of his incessant toil; no other man, probably, either could or would so move about from place to place. October 16th he started from London for Wolverton; he preached at Wolverton on the 17th and 18th: opened school and went on to Rugby. Next day, at Derby, he preached to 2,000 workmen of the Midland Railway Company; "back to Tamworth, and out to Ingestre with Lord Shrewsbury." On the 20th, "prepared sermon for Lichfield" in the morning; drove to Colwich in the afternoon and preached. Next day, church consecrated at Kingcote, and he preached. On 22nd, at Lichfield, "up early and finished sermon; cathedral excellent, services striking; luncheon, Lord Lichfield presiding; preached at afternoon service." On 23rd, S. P. G. meeting in Derby. Next day, "early breakfast, and in with Lord Vernon, Duke of Devonshire, Lord Lichfield, &c., &c., to Derby;" preached. Next day, S. P. G. meeting. On 26th, "off for York; very much tired at night. Reading and thinking about Oxford sermon." Next day (Sunday), Bishopthorpe; "preached at Minster;" "sleepy, *ehou*, at afternoon service; *must* eat no luncheon on Sunday; walked with Archbishop five miles," and so on. After two "capital" meetings he left Bishopthorpe on the 31st, writing his Oxford sermon all day in train, *viâ* Manchester to Shrewsbury. On November 1, there was "a grand gathering at the service," a hundred clergy; "great luncheon; Lords Powis, Dungannon, &c." Next day, S. P. G. meeting; "off for Oxford. Finished sermon in train. Dined and slept at Principal's of Jesus." Next day

<sup>1</sup> According to Lord Carlisle's diary, the Bishop told a characteristic speech of the Bishop of Exeter. A lady to whom he was showing his place at Torquay, bored him with indiscriminate praise. At last she said, "And it is so Swiss!"—"Oh, very Swiss; only there are no mountains here, and there is no sea in Switzerland!" The same story, *mutatis mutandis*, is told in Lady Bloomfield's "Reminiscences" of Archbishop Whately and the Bay of Dublin.

(Sunday), "Merton service; Confirmation and Celebration early; thence to St. Mary's; great gathering, preached with interest." Next day, the 4th, business; party at Cuddesdon. Next day, meeting in Oxford; "same party at Cuddesdon." The 6th, "Merton service—meeting in Hall; then off to London; on to Shardeloes." The 7th, "up early and prepared sermon; then wrote letters; Colehill Church consecrated, all went well, D.G." On the 8th, the Bishop rode through Wycombe to Shirburn Castle, where he met a large party of neighbouring clergy at dinner. The diary records: "Tired—very—at night." No wonder! On the 9th we read: "Up early; prepared sermon and wrote letters, preached and celebrated. Rode after luncheon to Cuddesdon. Drove into Oxford—Warden of All Souls." The next day (Sunday), he preached twice; one sermon old, the other new. On Monday morning, at eight o'clock, off for Banbury; preached at Great Barford. On Tuesday, preached in Banbury. On Wednesday, the 13th, up to town and down to Aylesbury. As to the next two days, we quote the diary entries, thus:—

Nov. 14. Breakfast; church 10.30. Wrote with Cust. Meeting of societies. Disraeli spoke for an hour on Church; clever electioneering speech to Clergy and Church. On by rail; wrote, &c.; and by Derby to Chatsworth, Lords Carlisle, Belper, C. Cavendish; Gladstone, &c.

Nov. 15. Morning, walked with Gladstone, Lord Carlisle, Duke, &c., to conservatory and grounds. Conservatory in great beauty. Then over House with ladies; then rode with Gladstone, Duke, and Lord Carlisle. Oak tree on fire; and Gladstone's characteristic energy displayed in putting it out. All the sons here, and pleasant.

In the same year Dr. Wilberforce busied himself about the Missionary Bishops Bill. He wrote to Mr. Gladstone:—"There is a keen feeling on the subject throughout the Church, and it is one of those questions of liberty for which we look anxiously for some help from your presence in a Cabinet which needs some sets-off for all our high appointments being given to those who have, and because they have, rejected the principles of our Church." This is strong language; but Dickens's term "Pickwickian" may cover it. In a clever postscript, the Bishop remarks:—"You have always objected to the Jerusalem Bishops Bill, and on that we must be thrown if Shaftesbury triumphs." The Bill failed to pass into law, but a license was obtained for the consecration of Mr. Staley as Missionary Bishop in the Sandwich Islands.

Some passages in the Bishop's diary, relating to the death of the Prince Consort, have a touching interest; they supply evidence of the deep feeling with which he took part in the funeral. For instance:—

Dec. 23. Off with the Dean for Windsor. The funeral most moving ; many honest old politicians in tears as it proceeded. Those two princes at their father's feet. His power for good gone.

In July of the following year the Missionary Bishops Bill was again introduced. There was more than one sharp passage of arms between the Bishop and the Chancellor, and on the whole Lord Westbury got the worst of it. On the advice of Lords Derby and Granville, the Bishop withdrew the Bill.

In a letter to a bishop about lay-deacons, Wilberforce, with characteristic confidence, makes this statement :—"If you find laymen who will work under you, I would by all means use them—without their giving up their pursuits—in the service of the sanctuary. But I would not call them deacons, nor ordain them with laying on of hands. I am persuaded that having a double order under the same name, *i.e.* deacons who have renounced all for the ministry, and those who have not, is contrary to primitive use." This statement, we believe, is erroneous. The lately expressed opinion of the Bishop of Durham, regarding "primitive use," may here be quoted. In his Charge, Bishop Lightfoot says :—

Against this measure (the Permanent Diaconate) I have no objection to urge on principle. I do not see how I can find fault with the pursuit of secular avocations in the ministers of a Church whose chief Apostle was a tent-maker. Precedents, too, in later ages are sufficiently frequent to justify this combination of the spiritual office with the secular work.

There are some deeply interesting passages relating to Sisterhoods. One striking sentence in a letter to Mr. Carter, about Clewer, may well be quoted :

"Evasion seems to me the very clinging curse of everything Roman and Romanistic."

The volume contains several good anecdotes. Here is one :

A conversation arose after dinner as to the difficulty of putting some English words into Latin. "You cannot put *hearse* into Latin," said one. "Oh ! that is very easy," said the Bishop, "*Mors omnibus.*"

Here and there in this volume appears an edifying passage upon prayer. The tone of the Bishop's language is deeply spiritual<sup>1</sup> For instance, in replying to one who had asked him about the apparent failure of his ministerial work, he writes :—

Show the people that you have a pastor's heart, and I do not think they will be long in giving you the natural return, the support of the parish. I cannot tell you how earnestly I long for such a change in your ministry in its fundamental character. I see not the love of Christ, I see not the

<sup>1</sup> As regards Prayer and Missions, the Bishop's language does no discredit to his Evangelical training. But in looking out those passages of the diary which relate to his spiritual life we somehow miss feelings of JOY.

love of souls, I see not faith in your Master's presence in it. Your ministry looks to me like the stunted unwilling service of that fearful character, the mere professional priest. God knows if this is so. I speak but of the aspect which outwardly your ministry wears. My *advice*, for which you ask, is: PRAY—pray for more thorough conversion of heart—pray for ministerial zeal—pray for love to Christ. Pray for the outpouring of the Spirit on your own soul and on your ministry, and then live in your parish, live for your parish, work in it as a man only can work who has come to his work from intercession for his people.

In a letter to a clergyman of whose rubrical deficiency some parishioner had privately complained to the Bishop, we observe a statement that on St. Bartholomew's Day, which fell on a Sunday, "the proper course would have been to read the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the Saint's day." Now, we do not defend disobedience. *When the law is clear, i.e.*, when among reasonable men there is no dispute upon a point, or when the Courts have given a decision about it, an incumbent ought to obey the direction of the Ordinary. As a rule, indeed, the proper course, in our judgment, is to submit to the formally expressed direction of the Ordinary. A clergyman may doubt whether he is legally bound to read the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the Saint's day on a Sunday; there is no rule on the point; but clearly this is one of the cases where the Bishop is empowered by the rubric to "take order."

In September, 1862, Archbishop Sumner died, at the age of eighty-two, after a long illness. At the end of August the Bishop had been staying with Mr. Gladstone, and the diary records: "Drove to Aber, and walked up the valley with Gladstone; a good deal of talk with him about Church promotions, &c. He takes more part than I thought. But spoke of the Bishop of Chester as bearable for Canterbury!!!" The notion of Graham for Canterbury called forth three notes of admiration, and it seems as though for several days Wilberforce could hardly speak of it. On the 5th, however, the day before the good Archbishop died, he wrote to Mr. Gladstone: "If such a conjuncture happened as we spoke of, Lichfield or Winchester would be a thousand times better for the Church than Chester to push into the vacant chair." As soon as he heard the chair was vacant he wrote "a few hasty lines" to Mr. Gladstone, "not knowing what haste there might be in resolving on the successor." He thought that the Archbishop of York would be the best; otherwise the Bishop of Winchester. He "very earnestly" desired, indeed, that his friend's influence should be used for getting Bishop Sumner to succeed his brother. This would leave "a GOOD appointment for Lord Palmerston." Who, then, should succeed Bishop Sumner at Winchester? On this point Wilberforce was silent. Bishop



Sumner at this time, it may be noted, was seventy years old. On September 10 Mr. Gladstone replied, saying that he had written to Lord Palmerston, urging strongly the appointment of some one who combined in his own person moderation with learning and piety, and glancing favourably at age as a condition of fitness for the primacy, and finally referring, by way of example, to the Archbishop of York. Mr. Gladstone further said that he thought this appointment would not be made; yet, if it were, he said that in his mind there was not the smallest doubt that the Bishop was the person who ought to succeed to York. On September 25 the diary records:—

(Doncaster.) Called on Dr. Vaughan, who told me that the Archbishop of York had to-day received the offer of Canterbury, and accepted. God be praised! He can overrule all.

The next day the Bishop wrote to an intimate friend, as follows:—

I suppose to-morrow's papers will tell you that York goes to Canterbury; quite surely an answer to prayer, looking at what we might have had. We shall have peace and holiness, and a steady adherence to Church principles in him. God be thanked . . . I preached to marvellously still church, *full* here (Doncaster) to-day.

After the appointment had been made to Canterbury, Mr. Gladstone, we read, "wrote to Lord Palmerston strongly pressing the appointment of the Bishop of Oxford to York. That Mr. Gladstone failed in securing this appointment for the man whom all England looked upon as the most peculiarly fitted for the Archbishopric of the Northern Province, and that the Bishop's former curate was appointed instead, is now a matter of history." The following letter expresses the Bishop's thanks to Mr. Gladstone for the part he had taken:—

MY DEAR GLADSTONE,—I thank you from my heart for having let me see your letter. It humbled and it cheered me. Humbled me to see how far too kindly you judged of me; cheered me more than I can say to know that such a man as you so wrote about me.

To the Bishop, no doubt, the disappointment was severe. "There must be some history," he wrote to a friend, "if only we could get it, because only last week Sir C. Wood had told Admiral Meynell that I was to be appointed." To Bishop Tait, in the first instance, the Archbishopric was offered; and if he had gone to York, Lord Palmerston might have promoted Wilberforce. In the diary, at all events, appears this entry:—

Dec. 16.—(Windsor). Talk with the Dean; he told me that if London had taken York, I was to be offered London.

Three months before this bit of gossip was recorded, the

Bishop and Lord Palmerston had met on a platform at Winchester. In his diary Wilberforce writes:—"Lord Palmerston at meeting; very, very clever—twisted one sentence of mine sorely." This sentence was:—"The schoolmasters are to be religious teachers; not teachers of religion." As everybody knows, the Bishop's relations with the Premier were not very friendly. According to the *Times*, Samuel Wilberforce was "never out of collision with Lord Palmerston from March 30, 1837,<sup>1</sup> when the former as rector of Brightsome delivered an attack on the latter so tremendous that the Duke of Wellington, sitting in the chair, only abstained from interfering, he said, for fear of drawing the fire upon himself. This was reported at Oxford as a very grand achievement, but there is no doubt it cost Samuel an Archbishopric. He had his amusement, and he paid for it." This is flippant. Wilberforce would have been recommended for the Archbishopric, no doubt, if such an appointment had been thought expedient by Lord Palmerston and the noble Earl with whom on such questions the Premier took counsel; but he was not trusted. When Bishop Thomson was translated to York, it was said that his ability, backed by the high position, would make him a match for S. OXON, and he was.

It may be convenient, in this connection, to quote a few of the Bishop of Oxford's remarks on Lord Palmerston. In March, 1863, he had written to Mr. Gladstone about the Premier's "wicked appointments," insults "to every sound Churchman;" and in June he wrote to Mr. Gordon, in a very bitter vein, as follows:—

"That wretched Pam seems to me to get worse and worse. There is not a particle of veracity or noble feeling that I have ever been able to trace in him. He manages the House of Commons by debauching it, making all parties laugh at one another. . . . I think if his life lasts long it must cost us the slight remains of Constitutional government which exist amongst us."

In his triennial Charge (November, 1863) the Bishop "touched on the hindrances which had been alleged in the answers sent by the clergy, which fell under three heads: Dissent, bad cottages, and beershops." He "did not," says the biographer, "class Dissenters and beershops together as hindrances." This is true. Yet some pungent criticism of the Charge was spoken in the House of Commons, later on, by an able and respected Nonconformist whom Mr. Gladstone placed upon the Treasury Bench.

---

<sup>1</sup> The meeting was at Winchester (vol. i. p. 107). In his speech, Lord Palmerston took a line which Mr. S. Wilberforce "considered inconsistent with true Churchmanship."

Chapter IV. (1861—1866) contains several passages of interest with regard to the Court of Appeal. The aim of Wilberforce was to remove the spiritual element from the Judicial Committee; questions of doctrine should be brought before Referee Prelates. In a marvellously clever letter to Lord Westbury (p. 109), he wonders that "one of so clear an intuition and so masterly an intellect" should not dislike presiding at "that most anomalous Court." He says:—

I propose, not that the ecclesiastics should be asked how the Church is to decide, but that whenever a question of the Divine law is involved in the decision, the ecclesiastics should be asked what is the doctrine of the Church of England.

In the same subtle letter the Bishop says, that if in the Gorham case had gone forth an "ecclesiastical answer that the Church of England taught that every rightly baptized infant was regenerate," this "would have saved us from the schism under which we have ever since languished." Now, if the reader will turn to the second volume of the "Life" (THE CHURCHMAN, vol. iv., p. 125), he will see how groundless is the assertion that the Gorham judgment drove Manning to Rome. He "went over" in the year 1850, but he had made up his mind about "unity" in the year 1841. Newman went over in 1845.

In February, 1865, at Lambeth, we read in the diary, there was a "long discussion on Court of Appeal;" we read also of the "Archbishop of York's great wrath." Some of the Bishops who were present, probably, may not remember his Grace's "wrath;" but in any case, if meetings at Lambeth in those days were miserable and quarrelsome, S. OXON, according to rumour, was sometimes the cause. The feeling on the part of the majority of the Prelates seems to have been that it was best to leave things alone and not to have any fancy Court. Further, it is possible that the scheming of one of their number to obtain a leadership in the Episcopal Jury was seen through and tacitly opposed.

In 1864 the synodical condemnation of "Essays and Reviews" was brought under the notice of the House of Lords, and the Lord Chancellor (Westbury) declared that Convocation had no legal right to pronounce such synodical condemnation, because as all appeals must lie to the Crown, and as there was no appeal to the Crown from such condemnation, therefore the condemnation was illegal. The opinions of Sir Hugh Cairns and Mr. Rolt differed *in toto* from the Lord Chancellor's. He had threatened, however, to give a "grave admonition to the contumacious Prelates," and he made a personal attack upon the Prelate who had been the leading spirit in obtaining the condemnation. He said the "judgment is simply a series of well-lubricated terms—a sentence so oily and saponaceous

that no one could grasp it." The Bishop's dignified and impressive reply was received with cheers; and no devout and thoughtful person could doubt that on this, as on previous occasions in the "Essays and Reviews" controversy, he was speaking with all his heart in defence of the truth of God. Lord Derby wrote to him:—"I am glad to have been spared the pain of witnessing the Chancellor's disgraceful exhibition in the House of Lords, though I own I should have liked to have heard your crushing reply."

In November, 1866, the Bishop wrote to a friend:—"We have begun again on the Ritual Commission, and there is a great wish to condemn lights, incense, &c. I *hate* them as novelties; but I see so plainly that the party who hate all real Church progress are the people who object to them, that it makes me very doubtful how far we can go in repression without repressing that development of real Church life in which is our hope." This sentence will repay study; and it may be compared with other similar sayings; he would not act as though his action were the result of attacks.<sup>1</sup> But there is in it something more than a dislike of "Puritanism." There is a dread of Parliamentary interference, of "Erastianism." Yet further, it is evident, we think, that Wilberforce was desirous of "saving" all that ritual which persons inclined to go over to Rome might (in ignorance) call Catholic. In a remarkable letter to the Primate, December, 1865, he argues that an Episcopal attempt to reduce ritual, to define, repress, &c., would "drive many over to Rome;" and on December 29th he uses these words:—"I did not mean to imply that I approved of the use of the vestments and incense; so far from it, I have prevented it in my diocese." But that he desired to prevent it *in the Church*—that he was content vestments and incense should be declared illegal—he did not say. Before the meeting at Lambeth, in February, he had taken counsel with Mr. Gladstone; and the result was that no Episcopal address was issued. The Bishop received memorials from two Rural Deans, and these Mr. Wilberforce prints side by side. To Mr. Fremantle, now Dean of Ripon, the Bishop writes just as one would expect; he "deplores" and "trusts." To Mr. Butler, now Canon of Worcester, he says, "The Church's rule ought not to be altered." On every side the question was asked, "What *is* the Church's rule?" Wilberforce gave no reply. "The Bishop sounded no uncertain note," says his

<sup>1</sup> In his pamphlet, *Letter to the Dean of Ripon* (Simpkin, Marshall & Co.), Mr. Golightly showed, clearly enough, the Bishop's inconsistency as to Cuddesdon: "The Bishop having declared that the report of the archdeacons negatived every charge which I had brought against the College, proceeded to confirm those charges by making greater changes in the system of the College than I could have ventured to urge upon him."

son. We cannot agree with him. In his own diocese, no doubt, he prevented scandalous excesses; but in regard to "the Church's rule" in general, his sound, we think, was designedly uncertain. We shall explain ourselves later on.

In his Charge he described the Ritual development as being "like some brilliant fantastic coruscation, which has cast itself forth from the surface of the weltering mass of molten metal which, unaffected by such exhalations, flows on with its full stream into its appointed mould. Those burning sparks witness of the heat of the mass from which they sprang; they are not, in their peculiar action, of its essence or its end." This is pretty. But when we turn to matter of fact, what do we find? If legislation simply repealed the Rubric which was quoted as legalizing the restored ornaments, no rule as to ritual would remain; yet legislative measures, like legal proceedings, would, Wilberforce trusted, be avoided; peace would be obtained if only Ritualistic clergy would place the matter in their Bishop's hands. This is all; was it enough? We think not. Again, in February, 1867, the Bishops (of Canterbury) sat with closed doors, and a reply to the Lower House, moved by Bishop Wilberforce, and seconded by the Bishop of London, was carried unanimously. Its concluding words are:—"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." Has this resolution, good as it is, brought us nearer to peace? It has not. Again, when Lord Shaftesbury proposed to introduce a Bill on the basis of the 53rd Canon, Bishop Wilberforce wrote to Mr. Gladstone:—"It was *exactly* the idea for his cramped, puritanical, persecuting mind." Against this "gagging Bill" the Bishop planned and plotted with success. He spoke to the Bishops of "ignominy," "shameless party spirit," "terrible evil," and so forth. The end of it was, Archbishop Longley, over whom, unhappily, Wilberforce had great influence, gave way. The noble Earl was to be "hounded off" by being told that the Archbishop was preparing a Bill. But what was in the mind of Wilberforce? The Bill which the Archbishop proposed to introduce, drawn up by Bishop Ellicott, rested, if we remember right, on the Canons and usage; and this measure would have been favourably regarded by many High Churchmen; it was not so "narrow" as Lord Shaftesbury's, and it was approved by the great majority of the Bench, Bishop Wilberforce included. But Mr. Gladstone wrote to the Archbishop "very strongly;" and after an interview with the Primate and the Bishop of London, he had reason to believe that a Commission would be proposed. Lord Derby informed the Archbishop that the Cabinet were unanimously of opinion

that any proceedings in regard to Ritualistic practices had better be taken by a Commission "than through *immediate legislation*." Bishop Wilberforce thereupon wrote to his Grace :— "I reserve my own opinion, that *no legislation* is best of all." So far, then, he is consistent ; he steadily opposes legislation. He shows himself still, as we shall see, on the side of the Ritualists. He delights in generalities about "the liberty of congregations and the restraining and directing power of the Bishops ;" in the House of Lords he declares that he is a Richard Hooker man, holds a middle position, and so forth ; but in private, what does he say ? and on the Commission, how does he act ? We take our answer from the volume before us. His son writes thus :—

Some of the members agreed to form a private committee, and to move *pari passu* with the meetings of the Commissioners. This committee consisted of Lord Beauchamp, the Bishop of Oxford, the Dean of Ely, Canon Gregory, the Right Hon. Sir R. Phillimore, the Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, the Right Hon. A. J. Beresford Hope, and the Rev. T. W. Perry. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol joined, but after one or two meetings, deserted and went over to the other side. This committee, although less than a third of the whole body, was enabled, by showing a united front, to really guide the Commission, and to virtually settle the Report.

The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, probably, had no liking for a caucus ; he saw very well what was going on. But what of the Report, nominally Mr. Hubbard's ? Again we quote from the "Life":—

This draft Report, as the diary shows, was in reality drawn by the Bishop, and the secret of its success was the moderation of tone, and the judicious use of the word "restrain" with regard to vestments, instead of the word "abolish" or "prohibit." The main body of the Commissioners failed to perceive the elasticity of this word, which, in fact, did leave a loophole for the regulated use of vestments.

The Wilberforce caucus prevailed ; a loophole was left for the Mass Vestments. What of Wilberforce himself ? Again we quote the "Life." In a private letter to his son Ernest, he says :—"I was most anxious, for the sake of the Ritualists, there should be no making of the vestments in themselves illegal." Exactly. This is what we have said all along. He wished that "the rule of the Church" should remain undefined ; his own words as to the Church's rule are convicted of being purposely obscure. We quote the portion of this private letter which reveals what was in his mind. He says :—

I was most anxious, for the sake of the Ritualists, that there should be no making of the vestments in themselves illegal ; because :

i. This would, to a certain degree, have altered the standing of the English Church.

2. It would have prevented any use of them where the people do not object.

3. It would have stood in the way of any such gradual return to a higher class as alone can, I think, be useful.

In addition to this letter, so significant, it is hardly necessary to quote evidence against the Prelate who a little while before had solemnly declared, in the House of Lords, that he was not an extreme man. Yet it may be well to quote one other entry upon this matter:—

*Aug. 5.*—Commission; all day strong against a vote of no allowance of vestments in parish churches—beat 13 to 9. Bishop of Gloucester, as usual, all the heat of a deserter against me. Very much down. May God avert the evil I dread!

Here we may answer a question to which we have already referred. Granted that Wilberforce, although a High Churchman, fond of what Kingsley called “the pomp and circumstance of worship,” was no Romanizer, and had personally no sympathy with the extravagances of Ritualists, why did he not *speak out* as Hook did,<sup>1</sup> and why did he throw himself on the side of those who wished to “save”<sup>2</sup> all the erroneously termed Catholic Ritual? The answer, we believe, is this:—One “evil” which he dreaded was the secession of his daughter. He kept on yielding, and trimming, and leaving “loopholes,” because he so hoped to keep his daughter and son-in-law in the Church of England. But it was all in vain. In August, 1868, he wrote in his diary these most touching words:—

*Aug. 29.*—At luncheon a terrible letter from H. Pye, which almost stunned me. He is going over, after all, to Rome, and of course my poor E——. For years I have prayed incessantly against this last act of his, and now it seems denied me. It seems as if my heart would break at this insult out of my own bosom to God’s truth in England’s Church, and preference for the vile harlotry of the Papacy. God forgive them! I have struggled on my knees against feelings of wrath against him in a long, long weeping cry to God. May He judge between this wrong-doer and me!

Later he heard that they had really gone over (October 23rd), and then he writes in his diary:—“Lord, have mercy upon them, and forgive them, and let it not be the loss of their souls too! I hardly yet see it in all its bearings, only that bonds and afflictions abide me.” Again he writes, to a dear friend, how he has “striven, guarded, and prayed against this in all its most distant approaches.”

“Painful, indeed, it is,” we quote his biographer, “to with-

<sup>1</sup> *Quarterly Review*, October; CHURCHMAN, December, 1882.

<sup>2</sup> The diary (Feb. 13): “Hot fights in the Jerusalem Chamber, and I know not how much I shall save.”

draw the veil which overshadows this mournful episode; yet, unless it is done, the Bishop's life would be incomplete." We simply repeat our opinion, which we know is strongly held by others, who admired and liked Wilberforce, and knew him intimately for many years, that one "evil" which he "dreaded" when he threw his weight on the side of the sacrificial vestments, lights, and so forth, was the secession of his dearly loved daughter.<sup>1</sup> Many a High Churchman, we may add, has "laboured" as he did, and equally in vain. When a man or a woman receives Rome's notions of the "Catholic" Church, no loop hole in the rubrics of the Reformed Church of England is likely to prevent reception of Rome's notions of the "Catholic" ritual.

In September Archbishop Longley was taken seriously ill, and in October he died. It was a singular coincidence that the announcement of Mr. and Mrs. Pye's perversion appeared in juxtaposition with the death of the Archbishop. Wilberforce had no expectation of succeeding: he had received from the Premier, September 28th, a letter which he could interpret very well. He wrote to a friend that the fear of injuring his election-cry would "prevent Disraeli, in this, doing what, from his convictions, would be his own course." This was an utter mistake; Disraeli always distrusted him.

The Premier's letter was characteristic; and we quote the chief portions of it:—

I think the Chief Minister of this country, if he be ignorant of the bent of the national feeling at a crisis, must be an idiot. His means of arriving at the truth are so multifarious. Now, certainly, I hold that the long pent-up feeling of this nation against ultra-Ritualism will pronounce itself at the impending election. The feeling has been long accumulating; its repression might have been retarded; circumstances have brought an unexpected opportunity, and what I presumed to foretell at one of our Church meetings, some years ago in Bucks, has come to pass. The questions of labour and liberty are settled; the rise of religious questions may be anticipated in an eminently religious people, undisturbed in their industry and secure in their freedom.

It will be a Protestant Parliament, though it may not be a Church Parliament.

But there can be no doubt that every wise man on our side should attract the Protestant feeling, as much as practicable, to the Church of England.

---

<sup>1</sup> October 24 he writes to his son Ernest: "I do not see how I am ever to have them in my house, except when I am dying. The reason against Henry's coming equally excludes them." To which Mr. Reginald Wilberforce adds, in a note: "By his house the Bishop meant his Episcopal residence at Cuddesdon, not his private residence at Lavington, in which latter house his brother Henry was frequently a guest after he had joined the Roman Communion."



The point of this letter Wilberforce was far too clever to miss. He saw clearly that Canterbury was out of the question. He had written, September 11th, to the Premier; grieved "at the attitude of the Church party;" astonished that Dean Hook should oppose Lord Henry Lennox (at Chichester); expected that Deans and Prelates should be selected from High Church circles, &c.

Bishop Tait<sup>1</sup> went to Canterbury, Bishop Jackson to London, and Dr. Wordsworth was appointed to Lincoln. It may be that, but for electioneering considerations, Disraeli would have offered Wilberforce the See of London; and certainly his great administrative powers would have been of signal service in the metropolis. His translation, however, would not have been acceptable to "the snuffing Puritan clique" (p. 271), which was opposed no less to Bishop Wilberforce than to Mr. Gladstone. The diary, on December 11th, says: "Gladstone as ever; great, earnest, and honest; as unlike the tricky Disraeli as possible."<sup>2</sup> Mr. Gladstone was by this time in office again.

Mr. Reginald Wilberforce, we should judge, is a strong Liberal in politics, and Gladstonian in Church matters—like his father. It looks as if he had taken some pains to place Mr. Gladstone in the most favourable light. He makes no comment, for instance, on the appointment to Exeter of Dr. Temple—a writer in "Essays and Reviews," a book which "had been synodically condemned by Convocation"—he simply states that the Bishop refused to be on the Commission for Dr. Temple's consecration.<sup>3</sup> His narrative of the Irish Church

<sup>1</sup> "The Duke told me," writes Wilberforce at Blenheim, "of Disraeli's excitement when he came out of the Royal Closet. Some struggle about the Primacy. Lord Malmesbury said also that when he spoke to Disraeli he said, 'Don't bring any more bothers before me; I have enough already to drive a man mad.' My belief is that the Queen pressed Tait, and against possibly Ely, or some such appointment."

<sup>2</sup> In writing to an old friend he says, "Yes, Lothair is all you say. But my wrath against D. has burnt before this so fiercely that it seems to have burnt up all the materials for burning, and to be like an exhausted prairie fire—full of black stumps, burnt grass, and all abominations." He records with glee the *mot* of Lord Chelmsford, who was Lord Derby's Chancellor, but not Mr. Disraeli's, uttered at Knowsley in the year of his dismissal, "The old Government the Derby, this the Hoax." He picks up Court gossip: "Erskine said, 'When Lord Chelmsford surrendered the seals to the Queen, he held them back a minute and said, "I have been used worse than a menial servant; I have not had even a month's warning."'"

<sup>3</sup> In the diary, January 16, 1870, the Bishop writes: "Gladstone has produced a very unwholesome and threatening excitement by the appointment of Temple. With a very high opinion of Temple personally, I deeply regret the appointment, because he has so obstinately refused to part himself from the 'Essays and Reviews' in their censured parts."

agitation is clear and full of interest. Some injustice was done to the Bishop,<sup>1</sup> we think, in regard to his votes and speeches on Mr. Gladstone's Bill after the election; and harsh words were written by "party" pens, Evangelical perhaps as well as Tory. "Misrepresentations" were "widespread." The present writer was waiting for a friend in the lobby one evening when the Bishop was expected to speak on the Government side: in came the Bishop, and it seemed, somehow, as though he was being led by a Cabinet Minister. A politician, standing near, said: "They've got him, sure enough!" For something of this we think Wilberforce was to blame. It was known that he had been busying himself, *more suo*, on the Government side. One thing he did may be mentioned. As soon as the election returns were complete he wrote to Archbishop Trench to suggest a "compromise." Again he wrote (December 30th), forcibly stating that the decision of the constituencies was irrevocable; resistance, as to Disestablishment, was useless, even if, by some strange chance, Disraeli came in again. Who is he?—"a mere mystery-man," ready "to sacrifice any man, purpose, principle, or Church," "wholly unprincipled," &c. What then?—come to Gladstone: "a tolerably satisfactory result" would "follow *immediate* action on your part." This letter was widely read. The Irish Episcopate, however, would not plead with Mr. Gladstone. Yet the Bishop was prepared to publish his appeal "to the Irish Church to settle the whole question in a generous and friendly manner with Mr. Gladstone." He wrote a pamphlet; but Mr. Gladstone advised against its publication—it was too much to put on the Bishop individually. Archbishop Trench, moreover, cagerly deprecated the publication; and so the question of Disendowment was decided, as was most fitting, in Parliament. In his speech in the House of Lords, in committee, the Bishop frankly stated, that he believed the Disestablishment of the Irish Church would not tend to appease Irish discontent.

On December 23rd, 1868, Lord Cairns delivered the judgment of the Judicial Committee in the case of *Martin v. Mackonochie*. The Bishop wrote to a friend:—

I fear the effect of the judgment in many quarters. It is so palpably one-sided, and meant by Cairns to please the *Times*. I hear the lawyers were two and two, and the Archbishop of York gave the casting-vote for

<sup>1</sup> The diary:—"I am very sorry Gladstone has moved the attack on the Irish Church. . . . It is altogether a bad business, and I am afraid Gladstone has been drawn into it from the unconscious influence of his restlessness at being out of office. I have no doubt that his hatred to the *low* tone of the Irish branch has had a great deal to do with it." A later entry: "To Windsor. The Queen very affable. 'So sorry Mr. Gladstone started this about Irish Church, and he is a great friend of yours,' &c."

it. The Ritualists have brought it on us ; but it is a very serious thing to have the Supreme Court decide to satisfy the public, and not as the law really is.

It is "a very serious thing," surely, that a Lord Bishop should make such a charge without warrant against the highest Court of the Realm. As to the gossip thus carelessly repeated, and, we must add, indiscreetly printed and rashly defended,<sup>1</sup> it has no foundation. There were five lawyers on the Court.

In September, 1869, Mr. Gladstone wrote to the Bishop concerning the See of Winchester ; the "time was come for him to seal the general verdict, and ask if he might name me for Winchester."

Of the Bishop's work in his new diocese but little information is given. There is a silence, too, about his relations with Evangelicals. His diary records :—"Very low ; kindness everywhere." That he laboured with success, is in great measure, we believe, due to the fact that he was careful to consider the feelings of the "Low Church" clergy and laity with whom he had to deal. We heard, indeed, at the time, that he took counsel with the "puritanical" Earl, who, of all men, could advise him in regard to the masses ; we heard, moreover, that the Bishop was strongly advised not to meddle with such matters as Evening Communion, and that he took the advice.<sup>2</sup> Any-

<sup>1</sup> The Archbishop of York writes in the *Times*, January 6 :

"Mr. Reginald Wilberforce, on the Mackonochie judgment, asks, in answer to my saying there were six Privy Counsellors 'present and able to vote,' 'Does the Archbishop mean to imply that Bishop Jackson, only just appointed to London, and who had not heard the argument, voted? Such an insinuation is not worth answering.' The best answer it could get would be what I now give—that Bishop Jackson was neither present nor voted ; that, as the cause originated in the diocese of London, he could not have been engaged in it ; and that, as he was not Bishop of London till 1869, he could not have taken part in a judgment delivered in 1868. More will not be required for this 'insinuation.'

"The judges present at the hearing were Lord Chancellor Cairns, the Archbishop of York, Lord Chelmsford, Lord Westbury, Sir William Erie, and Sir J. W. Colvile.

"I repeat that in no judgment in which I took part was the decision given by my casting-vote."

<sup>2</sup> Only four days before his death he delivered an address to the Rural Deans of his Diocese, on which the biographer observes :—"This last was published after the Bishop's death by the Rev. Canon Hoare, from notes which were made by him and some others at the time. . . ." The reply—as against the Diary—is unanswerable. If there be this want of authority even in copious notes, made by several listeners, and immediately revised with a view to immediate publication, what must be said of a few short notes jotted down in a private diary as they present themselves out of the fast-fleeing memories of a busy day's work? For ourselves, we hold that the Bishop was decidedly stronger against Confession than he was some years before. From one who was present we heard that he was exceedingly emphatic.

how, there is no doubt that after the year 1869 he was less inclined to fight for what is reckoned "Catholic" Ritual, while he was more pronounced in his condemnation of Romanizing Ritualism, and also more inclined to cultivate cordial relations with the Evangelical School.

We close the volume before us with mingled feelings. On the whole, it is a relief to quote, about the "Bishop of Society," the opinion of a relation and of a Prelate, who were both well qualified to judge :—

"Cuddesdon, then occupied by her (Mrs. Tait's) first cousin, Samuel Wilberforce, was soon a centre of attraction to us. Her intimacy with this relation was very close. She had a true admiration of his many marvellous gifts, and especially of that fund of *true religious feeling* which he had inherited from his father, and which formed after all the *deepest and strongest element in his most versatile character.*"

These are the words of the late Archbishop (*Catharine and Craufurd Tait*, p. 62), written a year or two ago.



#### ART. V.—FIRE FOUNTAINS.

*Fire Fountains.* By C. F. GORDON CUMMING. London : William Blackwood and Sons, 1883.

THE title of the work before us, *Fire Fountains*, is judiciously chosen, as also is the season at which it makes its first public appearance ; though, indeed, the unusual mildness of the weather, at the time we are now writing, throws a certain degree of doubt on the latter assertion. This however is, of course, an accident which could not have been foreseen ; and if the present winter should yet exhibit itself in its natural character, it will be pleasant for the reader to warm himself in imagination at those huge fountains of fire, the evolutions of which Miss Cumming has so graphically described. Viewing the matter in this light, however, we are not sure whether we should not ourselves prefer "*At Home in Fiji*" as a book for winter perusal to the present work. When all nature around us is bare and bleak, and we are enveloped in winter fogs, it is doubly delightful to be transported to those

"Summer isles of Eden lying, in dark purple spheres of sea,"

where we can revel in the luxurious vegetation of the tropics, and enjoy, by an effort of fancy, the balmy breezes, warmed by the Southern sun, and yet gently tempered in their warmth by the cool waves of the Pacific. Now the descriptions of