

of religion and worldliness. From the very beginning almost there has been more or less of a contest going on between the ambition of the Roman Pontiff, and the sturdy spirit of national independence. If you look closely into the motives and origin of the strifes that have disturbed the peace of the world for the last thousand years, you will find most of them resolving themselves into this one question of the Papal Supremacy. It is not my purpose now to weary you with any argument on this subject, but simply to say that I consider the claim untenable on any ground, either of Scripture, or of true church tradition, or of universal consent, or of expediency, or of common sense practicality. Our personal interest in it is not so very great at present, but still it demands consideration and watchfulness, and we cannot be too careful to guard against the smaller and more insidious advances and aggressions with which we are familiar. The great difficulty is that the Roman Church holds, along with considerable error, much that is true, and much that belongs not only to her, but to all the Catholic Church throughout all ages. The Church of England and the Church of Rome have, from the beginning, been members of the one whole family in heaven and earth, and therefore it cannot but be a cause of additional sorrow that the latter should, by her own act, have broken the bond of love, and suspended the communion which should exist between sister churches.

From time to time it has been necessary for the Church of England to protest against usurpation, both in church and state; and perhaps at no time was it more necessary than at that epoch which you as a body have been established to commemorate. Whatever may have been the defects of the first two Stuart Kings, it is undeniable that they were faithful personally to what they conceived to be the interest of true religion. But the last two kings of that line were unhappily marked contrasts to their predecessors, and, especially James II., tried hard, by making the most of his royal prerogative, to bring the church and kingdom under bondage. It is difficult for us to place ourselves in the position which the loyal churchmen occupied in those days. These are times of indifference to religion, whereas, then men thought much, and felt deeply on this matter. Had I lived in those days, I suppose my loyalty to the person of the sovereign would have prevented my taking part in the revolution of 1688. And yet my duty to religion would have urged me to resist the coming danger of subjection to Rome. The seven Bishops who went to the Tower acted right, and they acted right again five of them, in refusing to transfer their allegiance to William III. Again, had I lived in Hanoverian times, I could not have supported the Pretender, against the dynastic change which had been accomplished, and the King reigning in fact through the Providence of God. The anointed of the Lord, even though he be far from faultless, ought, as we are reminded in to-day's first morning lesson, to be regarded with loyalty. Whatever may have been the shortcomings of the Stuart Kings, they were native born, and in those days this was a strong argument in their favour, although