

# The Church.

TORONTO, CANADA, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1846.

[WHOLE NUMBER, CCCLXXXIX.]

VOLUME X.—No. 21.]

## GENERAL VISITATION OF THE LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

(From the St. James's Chronicle.)

The Right Rev. the Bishop of London held a visitation of the clergy of the metropolis yesterday at St. Paul's Cathedral. His lordship was received at the western door by the prebendaries, canons, residentiaries, &c., at half-past 11 o'clock, and was immediately conducted to the episcopal throne. Prayers were read by the Rev. Mr. Packman, and the lessons by the Rev. Mr. Hall; after which an able and eloquent sermon was preached by the Rev. Dr. McCaul from the second epistle to Timothy, 3d chap., 16th and 17th verses.

At the conclusion of the sermon the Bishop of London pronounced the benediction, and the right rev. prelate proceeded to the east end of the cathedral, and took his seat on a chair within the communion rails. Archdeacon Hale sat on the prelate's right hand, the canons and minor canons occupied chairs on either side, within the railings, and the other clergymen present seated themselves on benches in front of the communion table. Mr. Shephard, the registrar, then called over the names of the clergy who had been required to attend the visitation. This ceremony having been concluded, the Bishop of London proceeded to the delivery of the CHARGE.

My Reverend Brethren.—The four years which have elapsed since I last addressed you from this place have been marked by a series of events of the deepest interest and importance to the Church of Christ in this realm; some of a very painful kind, and others of a cheering and encouraging nature. The most remarkable of these varied occurrences of the Church's recent history may be regarded as the subject of contemplation on an occasion like the present. God's more special dealings with his heritage ought surely to fix the attention and engage the serious thoughts of those who are set over his household to give them their meat in due season. It will be my endeavour, in humble reliance upon His grace, to place some of these topics before you, for your joint consideration, and to draw from them the lessons which they may seem to have been designed to teach the Church at large, and more especially you who are its ministers. But you will naturally expect that before allusion to the charge I delivered to you on the occasion of our last synodical meeting, which has given rise to so much discussion, and has called forth the expression of so great a variety of opinion. And, indeed, I might not do justly to avail myself of the present opportunity to do that which I forebore to do during the heat and violence of that discussion. I might enter into a lengthened defence of the opinions and counsels which I submitted to you on that occasion, and vindicate myself from imputations of which no person who did not willfully misconstrue, or strangely misunderstand, the plain language of that Charge, would have thought of casting upon me. I might easily fortify the position which I had taken, in all its most important points, by the authority of many of the ablest defenders of our Reformed Church, and re-assured under cover of their venerable names, what I am persuaded are the true principles of its doctrine and discipline. But I wish to forbear from all controversial reasonings on the topics touched upon in that Charge, lest I should revive charges which are now happily subsiding, if they are not yet completely at rest. Nor would anything tempt me to vindicate myself at the expense of the Church's peace. Yet I cannot pass over the subject altogether, without offering a few words, if not in self-defence, at least in explanation of my motives, and of the causes which prevented the Charge in question from producing the intended effect.

As to the motives which prompted me to recommend generally a closer adherence to the Rubric than had been generally practised for many years before, I cannot state them more clearly, nor more succinctly, than the words employed by our venerable Primate, in his Pastoral Letter, addressed to the clergy and laity of his province at the beginning of last year. Speaking of those deviations from the express directions of the Rubric, which had long prevailed in the generality of our parochial churches, his Grace observes—  
"There have, I apprehend, at all times, been clergymen who have been distressed by this inconsistency, and of late years it has been regarded by many excellent men as irreconcilable with the obligations which they took upon themselves on their admission into holy orders. Under the influence of these scruples they thought it right to adhere as closely as possible to the letter of the Rubric in their ministrations, whilst others, determined by considerations, in their estimation, of great weight, to follow the usage which they found established in their respective churches. Under which is not only inconsistent with the principle of times associated in the minds of the people with peculiarities of doctrine, and gives birth to suspicions and jealousies, destructive of the confidence which should always subsist between the flock and their pastors. To prevent the increase of an evil which might terminate in actual schism was confessedly most desirable; and the most effectual mode of accomplishing the object, it has been thought, would be found in general conformity to the Rubric. Universal concurrence in the several advantages of securing compliance with the law of the Church, and the land, of putting a stop to unauthorised innovations, and of excluding unchristianity, in their character decidedly cannot but regret that measures which, with a view to these good purposes, have been recommended by high authorities, should not have been received with unanimous acquiescence, as the means of restoring order and Church, or of effecting to the most scrupulous conscience."

These words describe precisely the view which I was led to take of the subject when I found that the churches of my diocese, and that I was appealed to by many of the clergy for my judgment as to the proper course to be pursued. It did certainly appear to me, while the consciences of those clergymen who were distressed by a sense of the inconsistency above mentioned, would be relieved by a more exact compliance with the Rubric, no minister of our Church could possibly object, on the score of conscience, to an ordinance, and, again, when licensed to officiate in a parish, with greater particularity, an opinion which I expressed in a charge, delivered nearly twenty years ago, as to the duty which appeared to me to bind the clergy to a strict and punctual conformity, with the Rubric, and I entertain little or no doubt but that if there had been, on the part of the clergy of the diocese, that "universal concurrence in the easy and obvious regulation," of which the Archbishop speaks, there would have been no serious or general objection on the part of the lay members of our Church. They could not then have stigmatised compliance with the plain letter of the law, and the terms of a solemn promise, as evincing a tendency to any particular opinions at variance with the doctrine of the Church. But the refusal of a comparatively small number of the clergy to act upon my recommendation was, of course, sufficient to preclude the advantage which I had hoped might result from

its general adoption, and to expose others, who might act upon it, to the imputation of peculiar opinions and tendencies—an imputation which, if all the clergy had agreed to observe the Rubric, could not have been fixed, on that account, upon any. This not having been the case, it is not to be wondered at, if, in many instances, the laity regarded with suspicion a return to the more strictly legal and regular mode of celebrating divine service, when, as the Archbishop remarks, so many innovations had been attempted which were really objectionable, and tended to alter the character of our Church. Nor am I disposed to censure with harshness that dislike of change which, if in this instance it was carried too far, proceeded generally, though not, I fear, in every case, from a real attachment to our Services.

The refusal on the part of some of the clergy to carry out my suggestions, and the speedy return of many others, who had adopted them, to the old practice, placed me in a position of great difficulty and delicacy with respect to those who felt themselves bound to fulfil what they deemed a solemn obligation, by following the directions of the Rubric. In several of their parishes a clamour had been raised, which it was found impossible to still by reasoning, and the peace of the Church seemed to be threatened with a serious interruption. Desirable as uniformity appeared to me to be, I could not but think that it would be purchased too dearly at the price of that increased irritation and discord, which would certainly have resulted from an attempt on my part to enforce, in every instance, compliance with those rules, the observance of which I had contented myself with recommending in my charge. I therefore deemed it right, after consultation with those whose opinions I was bound to respect, to inform the clergy, as opportunity offered, that I did not require them to observe that degree of Rubrical strictness which I had spoken of as greatly to be desired. At the same time it is manifest that I was not at liberty to direct any clergyman not to do that which the letter of the law required him to do. The utmost length to which I could go was to abstain from enforcing his observance of it, and to intimate to him, in private and confidential communications, my doubts as to the wisdom of his persevering in such observance, when he found it impossible to remove by argument and explanation the objections of the great majority of his people.

I am aware that some of the parochial clergy thought it was my duty to uphold them, at all hazards, in opposition to their parishioners, by requiring of them a strict compliance with the letter of the Rubric. But it is evident that if I had done this in any one church in my diocese, I must have done it in all—a course of proceeding upon which I was not disposed to enter, with a clear view before me of the certain consequences which would follow. Under all the circumstances of the case, I thought myself bound to consult the peace of the Church, rather than the wishes of individual clergymen, or my own character for consistency; and I cannot but hope that those of my brethren who were at the moment disposed to complain of my not having effectually supported them in their endeavours to carry out my recommendations, will see, upon reflection, the extreme hazard of the only method by which I could have done so, and will make due allowance for the difficulties in which I was placed. In justice to myself I am bound to state that, upon a calm and careful review of the opinions contained in my last Charge, I cannot discover any to which I need scruple to avow my continued adherence. Those which relate entirely to questions of doctrine, I think I was called upon, by the actual state of the Church, to declare freely and without reserve. They are not matters which admit of any question of expediency, nor may they be made the subjects of any temporising policy, as far as relates to the open avowal of them, with whatever degrees of charity we may think it right to tolerate the maintenance of different opinions on the part of others. But with respect to matters of outward observance, I do not know that I should have felt myself bound to press my opinions upon the clergy, notwithstanding the plainness of the rules which they are bound to follow, had I been fully aware of the amount of prejudice and misinformation on such questions which prevailed in the Church. I would, however, have this to be understood only of those questions of rubrical observance which have been the more especial subjects of difference between the clergy and their flocks; not of those which involve, either directly or indirectly, or by implication, any point of doctrine. "All changes,"—I again use the Archbishop's words—"All changes in the performance of the Service, affecting the doctrine of the Church, by alteration, addition, or omission, I regard with unqualified disapprobation. The danger to the Church would be great, if clergymen, not having due respect either to Episcopal authority or established usage, should interpret the Rubric for themselves, should introduce or curtail ceremonies at pleasure, or make Divine Service in any way the means of expressing their own theological opinions or party views."

It is, I am persuaded, by the use of unwarrantable licence in this respect, on the part of the clergy, that some congregations have been led to doubt the scriptural character of some of our offices, when they saw them ministered; or, on the other hand, neglected by the uninitiated; or, on the other hand, neglected by the introduction of unauthorised forms and gestures into the celebration of Divine Service, especially in the administration of the Sacraments. It is a just opinion of Bishop Bedell's, who, as his biographer remarks, "observed the Rubric so nicely that he would do nothing but according to it," that "the adhering to established laws and rules was a certain and fixed thing, whereas superstition was infinite."

And this leads me again to protest, in the most earnest manner, against the publication, by clergymen of our Church, of books of devotions, and homilies, and hagiographies, composed by, or principally derived from authors of the Church of Rome, and tainted with its errors. I know of no more probable method of unsettling ardent and sensitive minds, of perverting them from the simplicity of Scripture truth and worship, and of smoothing the way for their passing into the bosom of a corrupt and deceitful Church. I confess that I cannot understand how any person, professing to be a member of our own branch of the Church Catholic, can reconcile it to his conscience to be in any way accessory to proceedings, the effect of which, I trust, must be to diminish the seeming importance of those fundamental differences which separate the Churches of England and Rome—to make them dissatisfied with the doctrine and discipline of the one, and, in due time, with affection, the worst errors of the other. I can understand this conduct on the part of one of that society to whom it is permitted to disguise their real sentiments, and to assume any character which may best enable them to propagate the delusion of Rome; but I cannot comprehend the self-complacency which any person pursuing this course, could persuade himself that he is faithful to his solemn engagements as a clergyman of the English Church. I cannot but regard such a policy as more to be censured and feared than open, honest, undisguised hostility. Deeply as I deplore the loss of those who, from being amongst our Church's ablest and most zealous defenders, have become her bitterest revilers and assailants, I would rather see a member of our communion pass over at once to the adversary's camp, and from thence hurl defiance and reproach against

those whom he has deserted, than that he should continue amongst us only for the dishonest purpose of trying (and such purpose has, in one instance at least, been openly avowed) how much of the Romish system can be engrained upon our own; in other words, how much of error can be engrained upon truth, for this, and nothing less than this, if we hold in good truth the doctrine embodied in our Articles of Religion, must we believe to be the difference.

Under a strong impression that every approach to the practices of the Church of Rome, which is not entirely consonant with the spirit of our own, is not only needless, but dangerous, I feel myself called upon to caution my younger brethren against a special proposal which has been recently made, to form a sort of association or fraternity for mutual intercession. To the proposed object of such an association no just exception can be taken. The duty of mutual intercession is plainly enjoined upon us by the holy Apostles, and is indeed an unavoidable inference from the very nature of Church membership—an element in the communion of saints. It is, therefore, very right and proper that we should remind one another of this duty, and be careful to perform it ourselves; but I do not perceive the necessity, and I greatly question the prudence, of entering into any other association for that purpose than that to which we all belong by virtue of our baptism, and of our relation to Jesus Christ in His Church. One obvious danger of all such voluntary combinations is that of fostering a spirit of party. Those who enlist themselves will be apt to regard those who do not, as lukewarm and indifferent, and it almost always happens that they who combine for a somewhat indefinite purpose, find themselves, in process of time, leagued together for other objects than that which was contemplated at first.

This is one of many objections which may be urged against what is called the Evangelical Alliance, an association of which, although it contains within itself the elements of disunion, and must soon crumble into pieces, if it be not turned into a mere instrument of aggression against the Established Church, I must express my strong disapprobation.

But to revert to the proposal in question. We have been publicly invited from time to time, by zealous and well-meaning individuals, to unite in prayer on certain days for certain specified objects, and although I have always considered this to savour somewhat of presumptuousness on the part of persons not holding authority in the Church, I did not think it likely to produce any serious inconvenience. In fact the attempt was too vague to have any considerable effect. But when it is proposed to establish something of the solidity or brotherhood, for mutual intercession, the members of which are to have their names registered, in order that they may be informed of particular objects to be prayed for, either of general interest, or connected with themselves or their own friends, the plan seems to me to be open to the objection which I have stated, as being likely to form or bind together a secret party in the Church, and to teach them the necessity of doing something more than the Church instructs them to do, or of doing it in a different manner. This apprehension is very much strengthened when I observe, that the "several objects of intercession should be remembered at the Holy Communion, with the prayer, that the memorial made before God of the Sacrifice on the Cross may be accepted, in behalf of them." Now, this notion of an offering, which those who communicate in the Eucharist make in behalf of others, over and above their prayers, seems to me, I confess, to be essentially the same as that which is condemned by our 31st Article. I consider it to be the plain doctrine of our Church, that the effects of that Holy Sacrament are limited to the faithful communicant; and that there is nothing in it in the nature of a truly propitiatory sacrifice.

It is only an act of devotion and obedience in those that "eat and drink worthily"; and though in it they ought to pray for the whole body of the Church, yet those their prayers do only prevail with God, as they are devout intercessions, but not by any particular virtue in this action." (Barnet on Article Thirty-one.)

He who believes that the Eucharistic memorial will not only benefit himself as a channel of grace to his own soul, but also be accepted by God in behalf of others, who do not partake of it, is in danger of being led astray, by no very difficult steps, to a belief that "the Priest does offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain and guilt." As if for the purpose of facilitating this transition from the doctrine of our Reformation to that of Rome, we find in the Rubric to which I allude, "the additions to the Hours are subjoined in Latin for those who may use them in that language." But while I think myself called upon to caution my younger brethren against the particular form in which this plan of mutual intercession has been proposed to them, I entirely agree with its authors in thinking that a special obligation to the performance of the duty itself is laid upon us by the present state and prospects of the Church—that "the conversion of sinners and awakening of the listless is a proper object for our united prayers;" that "the advancement and perseverance of the faithful," (and surely we may well add, the recovery of those who have lapsed), "is a thing for which we have need to seek help from above;" and that in many instances general prayers will be used the more seriously, and with less chance of interruption, when particular cases are kept in view. I would add, that the present difficulties in which it is pleased Divine Providence to involve our country, by visiting the people of Ireland with severe distress, may very fitly be recommended by you to your people as a subject of particular intercession, both in their family and private devotions.

The efforts which have for some time past been systematically made to revive amongst the members of our own communion, opinions and practices which have been usually regarded as peculiar to the Church of Rome, necessarily tend, as I have before observed, to perplex and unsettle sensitive and imperfectly instructed consciences, and to prepare them for an acknowledgment of the paramount authority of that Church, which, as it concedes nothing, nor admits the possibility of its erring, even in the minutest feature of that complicated system, which was stamped with the character of unchangeableness by the decrees of the Council of Trent, has manifestly a great advantage in dealing with unstable and doubtful minds, when even one step has been taken in advance towards that system. This is especially the case with females, the natural constitution of whose minds disposes them to rest upon the authority of others; while their livelier sensibilities are more easily excited and satisfied by an aesthetic and ceremonial form of religion. Indeed, I think it is in minds of this class—even in our own sex also, with some exceptions,—that a Romanising tendency is most perceptible. Some few there are who seem to have been caught in the meshes of their own subtlety; others appear to be perplexed by erudition ill digested and misapplied; but a great number of those persons who have been unhappily perverted (and, after all, how inconsiderable is that number in comparison with those who hold the faith without wavering), seem to have been misled by the treacherous lights of poetical mysticism, following the guidance, not of their reason, but of imagination, or to have fallen a prey to Romish sophistry, for want of sound and well digested theological learning. We must, I fear, look for more instances of perversion occasioned by these causes, and it behoves the clergy to be prepared with a correspondingly store of reasons

wherewith to combat the delusive arguments of Romish emissaries, and to establish and settle the faith of the weak-hearted members of their flocks. The present is too plainly a season at which it is most needful for those who stand on the watch towers of the Church to observe the approach of the adversary, and to cry aloud to every soul that is given to them in charge, "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free," and be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage." In pursuing those studies which may qualify them for the effective discharge of their duty, I would recommend my younger brethren to direct their special attention to the subject of Papal infallibility, which is inseparably connected with that of supremacy. I am persuaded that this, although it is really the most unreasonable and the least demonstrable of all the grounds upon which the Romish Church claims our allegiance, is that which is most successfully put forward by her agents, to ensnare tender consciences, and to perplex weak understandings. The slavery of opinion is the natural consequence of the process of men's minds, in matters of high concernment and controverted certainties, to take up the conclusions of others who are supposed to have greater advantages for the discovery of truth, and who are sufficiently positive in asserting that they have found it.

There is no attribute which men would more gladly recognise in a teacher to whom they resort for instruction than that of infallibility, and in proportion to the importance of the truth sought for, and to the supposed difficulty of ascertaining them would be the readiness of ordinary minds to recognise the existence of that attribute in one who, in addition thereto, claimed the prerogative which the Supreme Author and Source of Truth has not seen fit to delegate to any mortal being, that of finally and peremptorily deciding all controversy.—Unstable and unformed minds are most easily captivated by the promise of the conclusive settlement of all their doubts. They are too eager for the truth which that promise holds out to them, to scrutinise very narrowly the authority which pretends to give it. This is the leading feature of that strong delusion which takes so many captive and consigns them to word and gospel thralldom—the master spell which crowns and gives potency to the deceableness of unrighteousness.

To be assured by an infallible teacher that he is the only legitimate interpreter of the mind of Jesus Christ and the laws of His Church—that if they believe what he commands them to believe, and practice all that he enjoins upon them, they will be saved, is too comfortable a persuasion not to be eagerly embraced by many who cannot so easily substantiate to their own minds all that is included in those grand, simple, and that shall be saved;—"Believe in Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved;"—"Without holiness no man shall see the Lord." It very commonly happens that persons improperly instructed in the grounds of their faith, the writings or conversation of subtle disputants, assign as the sole reason of their sad change, the comfort which they longed for and imagine they have obtained in the shelter of an infallible authority, which resolves or rather crushes all their doubts, and spares them the trouble and responsibility of thinking and judging for themselves. They tell you that inward conviction is far better than argumentative demonstration—that they have found a harbour of refuge—that they feel themselves to be safe. But is it not marvellous that any person who has even a tolerable acquaintance with the volume of inspiration and the records of history, should ever be persuaded to venture his salvation upon the infallibility which at different times has stamped with dogmas and practices; which in one Gregory solemnly disclaimed and renounced supremacy over his brethren, and in another anathematised all who should call that infallible decree of Trent all those who denied inspiration, as did also Gregory the Great—that infallibility, respecting which the most learned doctors of Rome have never been able to determine where it resides, whether in the Pope alone, or in the Pope and the General Council jointly, or in the Church at large, and which, wherever it resides, has not answered its alleged purpose, having been, in fact, most instrumental in promoting schism, and in breaking the unity of the Church. This portentous doctrine of infallibility is in truth the keystone upon which the whole system of Romish error rests. Remove it, and the fabric crumbles into dust; while at the same time it is attempted to be established either by a sophism, the viciousness of which may be made palpable to the most ordinary understanding—"We believe Holy Scripture to be the Word of God, because the Church which is infallible has declared it to be so, and we believe the Church to be infallible because it is so," or by that unresolvable and presumptuous argument which, as Archbishop Whitworth says, places their belief of the doctrine upon prudential motives—"We think it convenient that there should be one judge of controversies for the whole world, therefore God hath appointed one"—an argument which they confess to be obnoxious to a possibility of erring, and, therefore, "truth, faith, and salvation" must rely upon a fallible and uncertain ground. This, however, is the assumption with which you, my Reverend Brethren, will most frequently have to contend, in guarding your flocks against the wiles of Popish emissaries, and therefore it is, that I would especially recommend you to make your yourselves masters of this question. It is inseparably connected with that of the Pope's supremacy, which, as it is taught by the Ultramontane writers, necessarily involves the assertion of his infallibility, while on the other hand, the admission of his infallibility leads directly to that of his supremacy, and the two draw after them a third most important question, that of schism, with which you will frequently have to deal. You will not fail to remind those of your people who may have their doubts excited by the confident assertion that the English Church is in a state of schism, that the true schismatics is not always he who separates, but he who makes the separation necessary. Upon this question you will find that everything that can be said has been said by Archbishop Bramhall; and with respect to those of the Papal supremacy and infallibility, I need hardly tell you that every argument which can be urged in its favour has been thoroughly sifted and solidly refuted in that treasury of learning, Dr. Barrow's "Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy," of which Archbishop Tiltonson truly says, that it has "exhausted a subject handled before by many others, in such a manner that no argument of moment, nay, hardly any consideration properly belonging to it, hath escaped his large and comprehensive mind. He hath said enough to settle the controversy for ever, and to deter all wise men from meddling any further with it." Yet the defenders of the Papal system deal with the question as though it had been exclusively determined the other way.

Notwithstanding this, so reluctant is the Church of Rome to loosen her hold, or to relax the complex and consciences of her children, that her partisans have lately betaken themselves to the use of a new weapon of defence, which, if its temper were genuine, would destroy the chain which now holds it together. When her champions long ago were defeated upon Scriptural grounds, and also by tradition; and when points connected with primitive antiquity were brought against them, and their great Diavole were unable to pre-

text them, they proceeded to undermine the very foundations of the Christian faith itself, by advancing the theory of "development," or rather, I should say, by reviving a system incidentally put forth centuries ago by more than one writer of the Roman communion—that the Primitive Church was ignorant of some things and assembled under unity was fully established. This theory reduced the Christian Scriptures from the eminence on which they had hitherto been placed in the common opinion of believers, as a final and conclusive revelation of the Divine will and counsels, to the level of a vague and imperfect announcement or suggestion of God's truth and purposes—a seminal principle, deposited as it were in the soil of man's understanding, to be unfolded from time to time by the Church as the exigencies of the case might require, and as men's minds might be prepared to receive it: it being assumed—that the Church invested with this most important task is no other than the Church of Rome. It is manifest that this theory involves in itself the radical principle of infidelity. The disciples of Meier and Newman are in that state of hopeful training for the school of Strauss. Uhlich, one of the leaders of the German Rationalists, "Friends of Light," says in his confession, "It is such the state of things, I think it is high time that the free-thinking Clergy made common cause, partly that they might not stand alone when they require advice under difficult circumstances, and partly that they may come to some mutual understanding with regard to the future development and constitution of Christianity. The primary principles of our efforts are those of our first meeting, viz. the casting away of all matters which are hostile to a free development of Christianity, and the application of our united powers, to the unrestrained building up of the kingdom of God"—"restrained, that is, by any respect for Holy Scripture." Whitham, another leader of the party, says, "Whenever our minds and Scripture are at variance, we say, 'reason is right, and decides on Scripture.'" It appears to me that the common sense and honesty of every mind which is tolerably well-informed, and believes the Bible to contain the word of God, will at once revolt from this theory of development, whether propounded by Romanists or Rationalists, as being inconsistent with the essential characteristics of the Gospel revelation, and will be in no danger of being entangled in the web of sophistry which its advocates have woven.

The theory itself will, we doubt not, before long be far more dangerous to the system of error which it is contrived to excuse and uphold, than to the truth which it labours to obscure. I leave it to others, and already many able advocates have come forward on behalf of Scripture truth and Christian honesty, to expose the unsoundness and mischievous tendency of this theory of development, and I will content myself with one very obvious remark, that although this may prove nothing as to the truth or falsehood of the theory in question, or of the decrees of the Council of Trent, both cannot possibly be true, being in some respects—and those fundamental ones—directly contradictory the one to the other. He who maintains the notion of development as it has been maintained of late, is unavoidably implicated as a heretic in the anathema of the Council of Trent, which condemns all those who teach that any one of the traditions received by the Church has not been handed down and preserved in continued succession through the holy apostles, from Christ himself. This, however, does not concern us any further than as it may lead us to regard with suspicion and distrust both the dogmatism of the Tridentine Synod and the latitudinarianism of development, so as seemingly to preclude the possibility of resipiscence and a return to truth, the other opening a wide door to the admission of every conceivable novelty of opinion or practice which the Church of Rome may at any time think proper to adopt and assert, however opposed to its former decrees. Indeed I strongly suspect that the advancing of this theory is an attempt on the part of subtle, but not thoroughly satisfied, advocates of Romanism, to emancipate that Church from the self imposed fetters of the Trent decrees; but how that is to be effected without sacrificing their *πρόσωπον* of infallibility, I am unable to conjecture. In closing these general remarks upon a subject which I could not pass over in silence, but to which it is not possible to do justice within the limits of an address of this nature, I have to recommend to your notice some excellent tracts on the errors of Popery, drawn up by the Rev. J. Endell Tyler, and published by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, as a means of countervailing the attempts which are made by the emissaries of Rome to unsettle the minds of our people by the dissemination of cheap publications. These tracts are admirably adapted to that end, and by the soundness of the arguments which they contain, and by the charitable spirit in which those arguments are brought forward. A more ample treasury is now placed within the reach of the Clergy by Mr. Brogren's useful and well-timed publication, *Catholic Safeguards*, which contains a selection of the ablest discourses on the errors of the Church of Rome, chosen from the works of our own eminent divines who lived during the seventeenth century. I now quit for the present this very painful subject, recommending you to make the unhappy divisions in our Church, and the great dangers to which they expose it, special objects of deprecation in your daily approaches to the throne of mercy, beseeching the one God and Father of us all to take away from us all hatred and prejudice, and whatever else may hinder us from godly union and concord, that we may be all of one heart, and of one soul, united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity.

Before I proceed to touch on some matters of a more general kind, I desire to recall your attention to one or two points, on which I dwell with some earnestness in my last Charge. One of them is the duty incumbent on you of celebrating Divine service on each of those days on which the Church commemorates the not only his nativity, crucifixion, and resurrection, which are everywhere observed, but also his circumcision, his manifestation to the Gentiles, and his glorious ascension. For each of these days are appointed an appropriate collect, epistle, and gospel; and that the last of them was intended to be observed with a special degree of solemnity is apparent from the fact that the Communion service, or proper preface to the Trisagium, is appointed for Ascension Day, as well as for Christmas Day, Easter Day, Whit-Sunday, and the feast of the Holy Trinity. The ascension of our Lord being one of the principal acts of our redemption, that which certified to us the entrance of our great High Priest into heaven itself, "now to appear in the presence of God for us," ought surely to be everywhere commemorated, as the Church intended it to be, and as it has long been observed in most of our large parishes. I need hardly remind you that it has been the Church's custom from the beginning, to keep this festival with particular respect. Augustine speaks of the solemn celebration of the passion, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord, and of the descent of the Holy Ghost, as being so ancient that it must have been appointed by the Apostles themselves, or by the general agreement of the Church in some plenary Council. "In like manner," says Bingham, "the author of the constitution puts Ascension Day into the number of the great Christian festivals, because on that day our Saviour's economy upon earth was completed."

The other point to which I alluded is that of daily prayers. In the Charge which I delivered eighteen years ago to the Clergy of this diocese I expressed a wish that the experiment of a daily service should be tried agreeably to the practice of the early Church, and of our own in better times. In expressing that wish I had in view the parish Churches in towns, and in my last Charge I stated my belief that where it had been carried into effect a considerable number of persons had been found to profit by the opportunities so afforded. I desire now to repeat that wish, and to state my decided opinion with respect to the metropolis, which I feel it to be deemed necessary to have daily prayers in any Church, opportunities of attending them ought to be placed within the reach of all the members of our communion, by having them in Churches not inconveniently distant from one another, an arrangement for that purpose being made amongst the incumbents; and in every large parish where there is more than one Church, there ought certainly to be daily service in some one of the Churches. None of our people ought to have reason to complain of being deprived, for want of such provision, of any one of the opportunities and privileges to which all the Church's children are unquestionably entitled. To censure a return in this particular to the practice of an earlier, but not very distant age, as superstition and formalism, is in the highest degree unreasonable and uncharitable; and I earnestly hope that no Clergyman will suffer himself to be deterred by the fear of it from adopting my recommendation.

In this respect I am sorry to say the inhabitants of the metropolis are worse off than they were a century and a half ago. It appears from the work entitled "*Pietas Londinensis*," which was published in the year 1714, that there were then daily morning and evening prayers, in no fewer than forty-two churches in London and Westminster, besides St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey, of which number twenty-five were in the city of London. I fear that if a new edition of that work were to be published, adapted to the present time, the numbers would stand very differently. As far as I can collect from the last annual returns, there are not more than about sixteen churches or chapels in the metropolis in which there are daily prayers. I will not stop to inquire into the causes of what I must consider to be a change for the worse; but I cannot help observing that where money has been left by pious persons for the express purpose of paying a clergyman for the performance of daily service, the receiver of such money is bound in common honesty to fulfil the condition on which he receives it. I cannot forbear from taking this opportunity of expressing a wish that some of our churches, in towns at least, were opened every morning for private prayer, in order that persons who could not easily find in their own humble dwellings a place of retirement for their devotions, calculated to solemnise their minds, might resort to the House of God where all would be in harmony with their feelings.

The mention of this subject naturally leads me to the general question of the provision made by the Church for the spiritual wants of that vast collection of human beings which is contained in London and its suburbs. Ten years have now elapsed since I called the attention of the public to this subject, by putting forth proposals for raising a fund to be applied to the building and endowment of additional churches. I stated that there were at that time in the metropolis and its suburbs, omitting all notice of those parishes which contained less than 7,000 each, a population of not less than 1,380,000, with church room for only 140,000—little more than one-tenth of the whole; and that in the eastern and north-eastern districts there were ten parishes containing 353,460 inhabitants, with an average provision of one church for every 19,000 souls, and one clergyman for every 14,000.—I pointed out the evils which were sure to flow from such a state of things, and said that it was a work of prudence, not less than of piety and charity, to impart to the multitude, who were barely acquainted with the first principles of Christianity, a knowledge of its truths and precepts, its motives and restraints; and that the most hopeful method of attempting this was to send more labourers into the great harvest field; to increase the number of churches and clergymen; to bring house to the doors and hearts of the most ignorant and neglected of the people the ordinances, the solemnities, the devotions, and the charities of our Apostolical Church; to divide the moral wilderness of our great city into unmanageable districts, each with its own place of worship, its schools, and its local institutions. For the ready, and in some instances, almost unprecedented liberality with which that appeal was answered, I am deeply thankful to Him from whom all good designs, and all works of piety and charity, proceed. The subscriptions received for the general objects of the appeal amount to no less than £170,855. A separate fund was shortly afterwards formed at the suggestion of a lay member of the Church, to whose support and co-operation in this good work that Church is deeply indebted, for the erection and endowment of ten additional churches, each with its parsonage-house and its schools, in the single parish of Bethnal-green, containing more than 70,000 inhabitants, with only two churches and three clergymen. The contributions to this fund amount to £60,000, so that altogether a sum of more than £230,000 has been subscribed for the purpose of supplying in part the spiritual destitution of the metropolis, besides the local contributions towards the erection of churches in those places where a part only of the expense has been defrayed out of this fund. Provision has thus been made for the erection of 63 new churches, of which 44 are completed, 10 are in the course of erection, two are about to be commenced, and seven for which grants have been voted will, it is hoped, before long, be put in hand.—These churches will contain altogether about 65,000 persons, and will furnish the means of attending divine worship once in the day to 130,000. It makes the total number of persons accommodated at any one time in church 205,000, out of a population (omitting as before the smaller parishes), 1,380,000; and, supposing what we by no means admit, that it is enough for each person to attend divine service only once in the day, 410,000 only have an opportunity of doing so, while 970,000 are wholly unprovided for as far as the Church is concerned. This is with reference to the population of the metropolis at the time when the proposals were put forth. But in the meanwhile it has continued to increase at the rate of 30,000 per annum, and therefore another 200,000 at least must now be added to the number of those who require some provision to be made for even their imperfect participation in the privilege of Church membership. It has been calculated that the number who can be accommodated in all the different places of worship, of whatever denomination, in the metropolis, amounts to somewhere about 600,000. I believe it to fall far short of that amount, and that the number allowed in that estimate for the contents of dissenting places of worship is much too large. The population itself being more than 2,000,000, an addition of 400 new churches, each to contain 1,000 persons, would not be sufficient to meet the actual exigencies of the case. It is fearful to think, and yet I see not how we can avoid the conclusion, that more than a million of souls in this vast aggregate of human beings are unprovided with the means of grace, and that for want of them thousands and thousands are suffered to pass every year into the eternal world, in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity, with no share in the comforts, or privileges, or joys of the Gospel. Is not this a case in which the resources of the State might be

used to the advantage of the Church?

It is a subject which I have not time to discuss, but I cannot help expressing a wish that some of our churches, in towns at least, were opened every morning for private prayer, in order that persons who could not easily find in their own humble dwellings a place of retirement for their devotions, calculated to solemnise their minds, might resort to the House of God where all would be in harmony with their feelings.

The mention of this subject naturally leads me to the general question of the provision made by the Church for the spiritual wants of that vast collection of human beings which is contained in London and its suburbs. Ten years have now elapsed since I called the attention of the public to this subject, by putting forth proposals for raising a fund to be applied to the building and endowment of additional churches. I stated that there were at that time in the metropolis and its suburbs, omitting all notice of those parishes which contained less than 7,000 each, a population of not less than 1,380,000, with church room for only 140,000—little more than one-tenth of the whole; and that in the eastern and north-eastern districts there were ten parishes containing 353,460 inhabitants, with an average provision of one church for every 19,000 souls, and one clergyman for every 14,000.—I pointed out the evils which were sure to flow from such a state of things, and said that it was a work of prudence, not less than of piety and charity, to impart to the multitude, who were barely acquainted with the first principles of Christianity, a knowledge of its truths and precepts, its motives and restraints; and that the most hopeful method of attempting this was to send more labourers into the great harvest field; to increase the number of churches and clergymen; to bring house to the doors and hearts of the most ignorant and neglected of the people the ordinances, the solemnities, the devotions, and the charities of our Apostolical Church; to divide the moral wilderness of our great city into unmanageable districts, each with its own place of worship, its schools, and its local institutions. For the ready, and in some instances, almost unprecedented liberality with which that appeal was answered, I am deeply thankful to Him from whom all good designs, and all works of piety and charity, proceed. The subscriptions received for the general objects of the appeal amount to no less than £170,855. A separate fund was shortly afterwards formed at the suggestion of a lay member of the Church, to whose support and co-operation in this good work that Church is deeply indebted, for the erection and endowment of ten additional churches, each with its parsonage-house and its schools, in the single parish of Bethnal-green, containing more than 70,000 inhabitants, with only two churches and three clergymen. The contributions to this fund amount to £60,000, so that altogether a sum of more than £230,000 has been subscribed for the purpose of supplying in part the spiritual destitution of the metropolis, besides the local contributions towards the erection of churches in those places where a part only of the expense has been defrayed out of this fund. Provision has thus been made for the erection of 63 new churches, of which 44 are completed, 10 are in the course of erection, two are about to be commenced, and seven for which grants have been voted will, it is hoped, before long, be put in hand.—These churches will contain altogether about 65,000 persons, and will furnish the means of attending divine worship once in the day to 130,000. It makes the total number of persons accommodated at any one time in church 205,000, out of a population (omitting as before the smaller parishes), 1,380,000; and, supposing what we by no means admit, that it is enough for each person to attend divine service only once in the day, 410,000 only have an opportunity of doing so, while 970,000 are wholly unprovided for as far as the Church is concerned. This is with reference to the population of the metropolis at the time when the proposals were put forth. But in the meanwhile it has continued to increase at the rate of 30,000 per annum, and therefore another 200,000 at least must now be added to the number of those who require some provision to be made for even their imperfect participation in the privilege of Church membership. It has been calculated that the number who can be accommodated in all the different places of worship, of whatever denomination, in the metropolis, amounts to somewhere about 600,000. I believe it to fall far short of that amount, and that the number allowed in that estimate for the contents of dissenting places of worship is much too large. The population itself being more than 2,000,000, an addition of 400 new churches, each to contain 1,000 persons, would not be sufficient to meet the actual exigencies of the case. It is fearful to think, and yet I see not how we can avoid the conclusion, that more than a million of souls in this vast aggregate of human beings are unprovided with the means of grace, and that for want of them thousands and thousands are suffered to pass every year into the eternal world, in the gall of bitterness and the bond of iniquity, with no share in the comforts, or privileges, or joys of the Gospel. Is not this a case in which the resources of the State might be

used to the advantage of the Church?

It is a subject which I have not time to discuss, but I cannot help expressing a wish that some of our churches, in towns at least, were opened every morning for private prayer, in order that persons who could not easily find in their own humble dwellings a place of retirement for their devotions, calculated to solemnise their minds, might resort to the House of God where all would be in harmony with their feelings.

The mention of this subject naturally leads me to the