

tomary order of the Church, as illustrated in our cathedrals ever since the Reformation. And I believe that—even in those lamentable cases in country districts where such disputes have led to secessions from the parish church and the erection of unlicensed buildings in which the majority of the parishioners have sought a refuge from the arbitrary proceedings of their parish priest—such evils might have been avoided, and all parties brought to a kindly Christian agreement, if reference had been made to the Bishop, that he might take order for composing differences of opinion, sanction by authority such changes as appeared really expedient, and restrain undesirable innovations. The English laity are not indisposed to bow to the formal decision of a Bishop, responsible in his high position for all his public acts, when they will not consent to be overruled by a private clergyman, who may have come among them only yesterday, or have suddenly changed his theological opinions, and with this change have arbitrarily and unexpectedly set aside the form of common worship to which his people were long accustomed. Men may doubt how far in a Church like ours, which so greatly encourages individual liberty, the discretion of the parish clergy ought to be restrained by more distinct legal enactment; but none, I think, will doubt that it is wise and becoming, and likely to promote peace and extend their usefulness, if, where the parishioners wish it, the clergy readily, in the exercise of their discretion, refer to the authorities whom God has placed over them. 2. But there is an excessive ritualism of another kind, to which, I suppose, in your address you especially refer, and which within the last year has caused a very wide-spread alarm in the Church. Certain persons have taken upon themselves so to alter the whole external appearance of the celebration of the Lord's Supper as to make it scarcely distinguishable from the Roman Mass, and they endeavour on all occasions to introduce into the other services some change

of vestment or ornament quite alien to the established English usage of 300 years. I am not prepared to say that these persons have not, in part at least, been influenced by a notion that the changes they advocate will give them a hold over the careless among our people through that gorgeous appeal to the senses in which the Roman Church delights. It is alleged that in large towns such ceremonial is not unpopular, and crowded congregations are pointed to as the result of its adoption. But I would have it remembered that among the multitudes in our large towns everything which is eccentric or even unusual, either in teaching or in practice, will have many admirers. The clergymen to whom I allude would be the last to maintain that they are sure to be right because many run after them, or that they can be justified in yielding against their better judgment to the uninstructed zeal of those whom they ought to lead. And if in some notable cases churches where a very advanced ceremonial is practised are filled, it is a serious question how far they are filled by the parishioners for whom they are built. I believe some have been struck by the way in which crowds of the most ignorant of our Roman Catholic brethren may be seen hurrying, to assist at the mass, and have been led to conclude that by imitating the ceremonial of Rome you may borrow its attractiveness, without falling into that false doctrine which is the centre and life of its ceremonial—a dangerous experiment in my judgment, and one which I fear experience will prove cannot succeed. To judge, indeed, by certain short unauthorized, catechisms and manuals of devotion which some of the supporters of this ritualism have already put forth, I fear they cannot succeed in this attempt to divorce Roman ceremonial from deadly Roman errors. I would earnestly entreat any of the clergy who are disposed to try this unworthy compromise to pause. The large body of those who are sound at heart and true to the Church of England I am sure will