

honourable gentleman says that I founded my argument with regard to the effect of this bill, upon those addresses from Australia, he must have entirely forgotten my argument. [Mr. Gladstone—I never said so.] I founded my arguments, not upon the addresses but upon the language of the clauses themselves. I told the house then with what diffidence and with what hesitation I myself, being a civilian, approached questions of law of this nature and of this importance; but I did not shrink from the duty which I thought was imposed upon me. I did expose what I considered would be the effect of this measure in a legal point of view, and was I alone in my opinion? I was followed, first of all, by the hon. and learned gentleman the Attorney General; secondly, by the hon. and learned gentleman the member for Aylesbury (Mr. Bethell); and, thirdly, by the hon. and learned gentleman the member for the city of Oxford (Sir W. Page Wood), and I think the house will admit that we need not, upon questions of law, turn to higher authority than those. It may be said that the Attorney-General, being a colleague of mine, would naturally be inclined to coincide in the opinion I had expressed, but that remark will not apply to the hon. member for Aylesbury, and least of all to the hon. and learned member for the city of Oxford, whose private wishes and leaning would, I believe, be rather towards the legislation of the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) than against it. The Attorney General confirmed the view of the law which I had taken. The hon. and learned member for Aylesbury declared that he need not go into the law of the case, for I had so clearly expressed the legal effect of the bill, that he could only repeat what I had urged on the subject. The hon. and learned member for the city of Oxford began his remarks with an admission which, I confess, gave me great pleasure, for he acknowledged that I had pursued a perfectly courteous course towards the right hon. gentleman. I watched what fell from him with some anxiety, but the hon. and learned gentleman did not say a word to invalidate the view of the law which I had taken, and to defend what I said were the tendencies, and what I considered were the objectionable tendencies, of that bill. The remaining point referred to by the right hon. gentleman was that respecting the argument held by me with regard to the supremacy of the Crown, complaining that I had in my speech and in dealing with the 7th clause of the bill left out the fact that although the oath of supremacy was dispensed with, subscription was required to the Thirty-nine Articles. Certainly I did not make any reference to them, and I had no idea this would be made a subject of complaint. As the right hon. gentleman laid such stress upon the point, I am extremely sorry I did not mention it, but it is quite unimportant as a portion of my argument. The house could never suppose, no one could ever suppose, that the right hon. gentleman would have dispensed with the Thirty-nine Articles; in such a case, the colonial church would be no longer in communion with the Church of England; it would be no longer the same church, and the omission of the Articles was not, therefore, to be thought of for a moment in a question of this kind. But I commented upon the remarkable fact that, for the first time under the clause proposed by the right hon. gentleman—for the first time it would have been possible for clergymen to be ordained without taking the oath of supremacy. In the clause I have mentioned the oath of supremacy was not adverted to, and I argued, taking that clause in connection with the first clause, that, contrary to the 36th canon of the church, and without the authority or consent of the Crown, the supremacy of the Crown, long asserted, long maintained, and undoubtedly still existing, would have been in these churches dispensed with. (Loud cries of hear. The right hon. gentleman, in my judgment, has said nothing this morning which weakens the force of that argument. I will not enter now into the question whether the oath of supremacy ought to be required in the colonies. It must be left to the House and the country to attach to the remarks of the right hon. gentleman upon this head whatever weight they are entitled to. I am not aware that I need detain the house further. The right hon. gentleman has now moved for leave to bring in this bill in precisely the same terms as those in which he introduced it previously.—[Mr. Gladstone—No?] So far from having any wish to impede the right honourable gentleman's desire to bring in an amended bill, I give my hearty consent to it, and express my wish that the second bill may be free from those grave objections which, in my opinion attach to the first. Of course I reserve to myself a full and unfettered discretion to take whatever part I think right on this question in a future session of Parliament. I shall not then consider myself released from the intention which in my former speech I expressed, if this question was not dealt satisfactorily with by some other parties—looking at the earnest desire expressed on all sides of the house for some legislation on the subject—that I should consider it my duty to move in this matter in another session. On the other hand, while I assent to the motion of the right hon. gentleman to re-introduce this bill, if the second edition of this measure, revised and corrected should be free from those objections to which the first was open—if it is well calculated to meet the desires of the colonies, to remedy the deficiencies which at present exist, and bring about that amended state of things which we all desire, there will be no member of this house who will be more ready to support the efforts of the right hon. gentleman than I shall be.

Mr. Gladstone wished to say one word on the personal point between himself and the right honourable baronet the Secretary for the Colonies. He had felt himself greatly aggrieved by the tone which, he thought the right honourable baronet had adopted in his speech on a former occasion, but the observations which the right honourable baronet had made this day convinced him that he must have been mistaken. The right hon. baronet's motives he never doubted, and he was now satisfied that his language had not exceeded the bounds of legitimate debate. That being the case, and it not being consonant with his disposition to quarrel, either in that house or elsewhere, he would spontaneously withdraw the words which had pained the right honourable baronet. (Cheers.) He regretted having used them, and sincerely hoped that in the discussion of this, or any other measure, he might never give cause of offence to any one. (Cheers.)

SIR J. PAKINGTON received with pleasure the handsome explanation of the right honourable gentleman. (Cheers.) The resolution was agreed to, the house resumed, and leave was given to Mr. Bernal to introduce a bill founded on the resolution.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30.

Just as we are going to press we received a copy of the letter of Mr. Kettle's *On the Representation of the University of Oxford*, and unfortunately have neither time nor space to do more than indicate its important contents. Dealing with the objections put forth against Mr. Gladstone, the author explains how he has been convinced that in the vote of the right honourable gentleman in favour of admitting the Jews into Parliament, there was no sacrifice of principle, but a mere question of expediency, constitutes the whole difference between him and such of his supporters as most grieve to differ with him. The true principle about Church and State, the principle of the 60th Chapter of Isaiah, as it was both theirs and his in 1241 and 1847, so it is theirs and his now. They have but disagreed whether at such a time this or that way of holding to it was best. Mr. Kettle then deals with the "Protestant" objection at considerable length, showing their utter untenableness where they mean anything, but chiefly their vague generalities meaning nothing, or worse than nothing, and then skillfully turns their force against Mr. Gladstone's opponent. On the subject of Church and State, we quote a short passage:—

"Mr. Gladstone's claim of religious liberty for the Church, in opposition to the too-commonly-received pretensions of the Parliament, is just the one course which must be maintained, if we are at all to keep the Church and State together, but it cannot and ought not to be maintained without giving Dissenters also, both Protestant and Roman, the benefit of it. Hence the line which he took in respect of the Papal Aggression: hence his anxiety to set forth distinctly, in behalf of all religious communities, the principle of non-interference on the part of the State in their internal religious concerns. In all this, I will be bold to say, he is doing more than any other statesman to uphold that which he is accused of disturbing—the remains of the old English constitution in respect of the alliance of Church and State."

Having replied to the charge of "unfitness" against Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Kettle inquires into the "fitness" of the Warden of Merton, and here we must make room for a passage on the candidate of the Hebdomadal Board, and the consistency of rivals:—

"And, what is a far more serious consideration, this marked preference on the Warden's part seems to imply that he is in some special degree a favourer and sharer of their ecclesiastical policy. What that policy is and has been the University very well knows; and so do those who have looked to Oxford, as in old times, for aid, in the trying distresses and perplexities of late years; when, e. g. the Laws of Marriage have been tempered with; or when Bishops of doubtful orthodoxy have been uncanonically forced on the Church; or, when the plain doctrines of the Prayer-book have been judiciously wrested, by way of keeping things quiet; or when were laymen, and even aliens, have been permitted to intrude on the trust and 'good deposit' committed to none but successors of the Apostles. I need not specify what measure of help and sympathy, in matters like these, the Church may expect from Dr. Marsham, as member for Oxford University, if the conduct of the governing board to which he belongs is to be our index."

"Then we have mention of his 'consistency'—his 'manly consistency of principle.' So far as this is meant to be contrasted with the supposed vacillation of Mr. Gladstone, I have said enough, if I mistake not, to show that it is irrelevant, since in principle Mr. Gladstone has not changed."

"But will you allow me too little words more upon this same 'manly consistency'? Is it, or is it not, true, that by successive changes within the last quarter of a century many of our ecclesiastical arrangements have been so altered, that he who was satisfied with them—I mean the existing theory—in 1827, would be inconsistent if he were satisfied with them now? So that the *onus probandi*, in point of consistency, cannot but be thrown rather upon those who are for ignoring all these changes, than upon those who see it needful to acknowledge them and allow for them. Can this be denied? And if this be so, on which of the two sides, *prima facie*, is the praise of consistency really due?—*London Guardian*."

(Original.)

THE CHURCH SCHOLAR'S NOTES ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Gospel according to St. Matthew.

CHAP. X.—CONTINUED.

Ver. 15. *Sodom and Gomorrah.*] The names of these overwhelmed cities, which had been notorious for the profligacy of their inhabitants, became proverbial terms to denote places extremely licentious.—Isaiah thus addresses the degenerate priests and people of Jerusalem—"Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah!" Isaiah i. 10.

— *in the day of judgment.*] 'day of visitation or punishment.' The reference appears to be, in the first instance, to the miserable ruin which was about to come upon all the Jewish cities—which ruin indeed symbolized, on a small scale, the fate which must, at the last great judgment-

day come upon all the nations of the world that resist the Divine plans.

Ver. 16. *Sheep in the midst of wolves.*] Our Lord foresaw that the doctrines which his commissioned teachers would have to deliver, would oppose the prejudices and excite the bad passions of those who are ignorant and ill-disposed.

— *vise as serpents.*] The serpent or snake was understood to be a symbol of wisdom—a tradition probably from the early time when it was declared that "the serpent was wiser than all the creatures which God had created."—"Wise"—"prudent," "cautious," "wary."—St. Matthew uses the word which is employed in the Greek Bible (commonly called the Septuagint-translation) in the passage just referred to. Genesis iii. 1.

— *harmless as doves.*] "harmless"—"simpleminded," "guileless," "remarkable for singleness of purpose."—They were to take care that the enmity exhibited towards them should be—so far as their conduct was concerned—groundless.—"Let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil-doer, or as a busy-body in other men's matters. Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed." 1 Pet. iv. 15, 16.

Ver. 17. *Beware of men.*]—"the men—the people of this land—the excitable, degenerate Jews:—be on your guard against their evil designs."

— *deliver you up to the councils.*] 'to the Sanhedrim and its courts.'—The Sanhedrim, the National Senate of the Jewish nation, received appeals from the inferior courts of justice. The power of inflicting death upon a criminal was taken away from it, by the Roman authorities, forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem.

— *Scourge you in their Synagogues.*] In addition to being places of worship, the Synagogues were minor courts of law.—In each Synagogue were three "rulers" i. e. magistrates, who could settle disputes between members of the Synagogue relative to money, &c.—The sentence of this "Council of three" was sometimes carried into effect on the spot: hence we read of persons being beaten in the Synagogue.

Ver. 18. *Governors and kings.*] "Governors"—the Roman proconsuls, procurators, procurators.—"Kings"—the persons allowed by the Roman government to bear that title.—These would be the authorities referred to, in the first instance.

— *The directions given by our Lord on this, as on many other special occasions, are of course to be taken as furnishing principles for the guidance of Christians, whether holding office or not within the Church, in all ages, and under all analogous circumstances.*

— *for a testimony against them and the Gentiles.*] "against"—to, i. e. to the persons in power.—"Gentiles"—the nations subject to their command.

Ver. 19. *Take no thought how or what ye shall speak.*] "take no thought"—"be not anxious and perplexed."—This passage gives no countenance to what is popularly called "extemporaneous" teaching—i. e. teaching which is ill-prepared and unattended before hand. The reference is wholly to those extraordinary, critical emergencies, which at certain periods in the Church's history, try the members of the Church,—and not to ordinary circumstances. To meet these, recourse must be had to all rational means of preparation.

— *it shall be given you in that same hour.*] "Hour"—"crisis," "moment of trial."

Ver. 20. *It is not ye that speak.*] 'It is not simply ye who are the speakers.'

— *but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you.*] 'the Spirit of your Father who is in heaven is the speaker through you.' It is a delusion to think that in ordinary times, an ordinary discourse, however exciting and apparently unprepared, is an utterance of the Holy Spirit.—The public authorized teacher is to exert

the faculties with which he is entrusted, using all the helps which education and study can give: he may then feel confident that the Holy Spirit indeed works together with him, and witnesses with his spirit,—and that too in a higher degree perhaps in him—than in those members of the Church who are not commissioned to teach. But beyond this, he must not think—nor should his spiritual pupils think—that he is divinely inspired.

Ver. 21. *The brother shall deliver up the brother to death.*] Our Lord here seems to repeat the words of the prophet Micah—"The day of thy watchmen and thy visitation cometh; now shall be their perplexity. Trust ye not in a friend; put ye not confidence in a guide; keep the doors of thy mouth from her that lieth in thy bosom. For the son dishonoureth the father, the daughter riseth up against her mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; a man's enemies are the men of his own house."—Micah vii. 4, 5, 6.

Ver. 22. *Ye shall be hated of all men.*] The Jewish nation were looked upon by their neighbours as selfish and unsocial, because their religious principles did not allow them to mix with other nations.—The Christians, at the outset of their history, were considered as a sect of the Jewish religion, and were described as men-haters.—Thus Tacitus, the Roman historian, speaks of them as "convicted of a hatred towards the human race.—And Suetonius, another Roman historian, calls them "a set of men of a new and mischievous superstition."

— *he that endureth to the end shall be saved.*] 'He that perseveres to the end, though surrounded with extreme perils, shall be rewarded with the salvation of his soul.'—There is here also included a promise of safe-keeping even in respect to the body. Before the capture of Jerusalem by the Romans under Titus, A.D. 70., the Christians of the city escaped in safety to Pella, a town in the mountains at the source of a little river which flows into the Jordan from the East, about half-way between the mouths of the Hieromax and the Jabbok.

Ver. 23. *Flee ye to another.* Continual miraculous interpositions were not to be expected. Rational means for the avoidance of danger were to be used.

— *Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel.*] This appears to refer not so much to the excursion which the Apostles were now about to make, as to that mission on which they would have to enter after his departure into heaven—when they would have to announce to all the cities of Israel—whether they would hear or whether they would forbear—that verily the Messiah—the Universal Saviour—had come.

— *before the Son of man come.*] The coming of the Son of man generally denotes, in the first instance, the destruction of the Jewish Metropolis and State: He then came, through the instrumentality of the Roman armies. His Church and religious system then came in and fully superseded the old Jewish system—the extinction of which was symbolized by the destruction of the great Temple, the foundation of which had existed for more than a thousand years at Jerusalem.

Ver. 24. *The disciple is not above his master.*] 'The person taught is not to expect better treatment than the person who teaches him receives.'

Ver. 25. *It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master.*] 'Let the scholar not be discontented if he receive the same fare as his teacher.'

— *If they have called the master of the house*] 'The religious system of our Lord—however much for a time suppressed and concealed—always causes itself to be known: like those fiery chemical substances which burn and blaze the more, the more they are sought to be extinguished with water.'

(To be continued.)