

Rome, and an allusion to the labors of the Apostle Paul and the mode in which the gospel was spread by preaching in the first and second centuries, by first influencing kings and rulers, whose mandates the people followed, the Bishop went on to say that the youth were afterward got hold of and trained and educated, and so the work went on. But he firmly believed in getting hold of and educating the youth of any nation, and that was the plan he said should be followed in China. Christianity began in China many years ago, but missionary work did not flourish much until the country was in some degree opened by the British arms in 1842. That was not so very long ago, and they ought not to be disappointed at what little had been done, but rather astonished at what had been accomplished, looking at all the difficulties in the way. The number of Christians in China now number 14,000—like John the Baptist, the missionaries had but gone before and prepared the way, for more would follow. The time had now come for greater effort, and what they should do was to endeavor to educate Chinese youth in sound learning and Christian truth—in everything that was good in the Western systems of true science, which he believed was not opposed to religion, but ought to go hand in hand with it. Secular education of itself, however, was not enough, and their aim was to connect it with an education suited for Christian work. They wanted an institution in which to train for the service of Christ, but he believed the true Apostles of China must be natives. It is our endeavour to raise the institution of St. John's College with that view. In the year 1875 he brought the matter before the Church when on a visit home, and got money and a great many promises of help, which he hoped would be kept. At any rate he had obtained enough to make a beginning. They propose to educate 200 Chinese students; and as to the buildings, they would be built in the Chinese style, and would be 200 feet in length by 130 feet wide. Two American gentlemen had come to China with the view of becoming professors in the college; and one Chinese gentleman who had been educated in America was ready to begin. He [the Bishop] hoped that all who took an interest in such work would come forward and help it. This was but a beginning, but many great institutions had had as small a beginning as this. Relying upon the goodness of God for success, he hoped He would put it in the hearts of all to help.

COLOMBO.—The June number of the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* contained an elaborate historical summary of the unhappy dispute between the Tamil missionaries of the society and the Bishop of Colombo. At that time a diocesan conference was impending, which was to be preceded by Holy Communion. From this Communion the missionaries desired to absent themselves, on the ground that the following practices, being usual in the Ceylon cathedral, were likely then to be observed, viz.:—1. The placing of a cross on or above the communion table; 2. The placing of flowers or other ornaments on the table; 3. The eastward position; 4. The elevation of the elements; 5. The mixing of water with the wine; 6. The washing of vessels at the table and partaking of the water. Bishop Coplestone replied at some length, and concluded his letter by saying that if they did not come to Holy Communion he could not ask them to join either in the conference or in the triennial visitation. A rupture seemed imminent, but the Bishop, anxious to conciliate, consented, on further consideration, to give up the cross, the flowers, and the mixed chalice, and to consent that "the breaking of the bread and other manual acts are performed in such a way that the congregation can see them," and also that "the consumption of the remainder of the consecrated bread and wine will be performed in the simplest manner compatible with the reverence required by the rubric." These very considerable concessions, which certainly indicated an earnest desire on the part of the Bishop to come to some agreement with his objectors, did not satisfy the missionaries, who insisted on nothing short of a total abandonment of the eastward position. There the matter stood last month. But the July number of the *Intelligencer* prints a letter from the Rev. J. J. Jones, one of the Church Missionary Society missionaries, in which it appears that the difficulty has, for the present at least, been surmounted. For this happy result we are indebted entirely to the Christian moderation of the Bishop. The missionaries persisted in their refusal to join in the communion which preceded the conference. The Bishop, nevertheless, not only admitted them to the Visitation and the conference, but even contrived a way in which the whole party might unite in the sacrament of love by inviting Mr. Jones "to administer the Lord's Supper in the cathedral, in our (i.e., the missionaries') usual way, so that all may have an opportunity of communicating." This invitation was accepted, and accordingly Mr. Jones writes—"We went over this morning and I administered the Holy Communion to the Bishop and presbytery, the Archdeacon assisting."

## Correspondence.

NOTICE.—We must remind our correspondents that all letters containing personal allusions, and especially those containing attacks on Diocesan Committees, must be accompanied with the names of the writers, expressly for the purpose of publication. We are not responsible for opinions expressed by correspondents.

### CALVIN AND EPISCOPACY.

DEAR SIR,—In answer to the communication of "C. C." in your last issue, I observe: It appears that John Calvin and other learned men wrote in 1549 to King Edward vi., offering to make him their defender, and to have Bishops as there were in England. Unfortunately, this letter was intercepted by Gardiner and Bonner, two Romish Bishops, and it never reached its destination. Calvin received an answer purporting to be from the reformed Divines, declining his overtures. The letter was discovered in the sixth year of Queen Elizabeth's reign, but Calvin was dead.

The following account of it was found among the papers of Archbishop Parker—"and whereas John Calvin had sent a letter in King Edward the sixth's reign, to have conferred with the clergy of England about some things to this effect, two Bishops, viz., Gardiner and Bonner, intercepted the same; whereby Mr. Calvin's overture perished. And he received an answer as if it had been from the reformed Divines of those times, wherein they checked him and slighted his proposals: from which time John Calvin and the Church of England were at variance in several points; which otherwise through God's mercy had been qualified, if those papers of his proposals had been discovered unto the Queen's Majesty during John Calvin's life, but being not discovered until or about the sixth year of her Majesty's reign, her Majesty much lamented it had not been found sooner: which she expressed before her Council at the same time, in the presence of her great friends, Sir Henry Sidney and Sir William Cecil. (Styne's Life of Archbishop Parker, p. 141.) Yours truly,

W. P. S.

### THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

FROM "THE CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW."

(Continued.)

After Walpole's treatment of Berkeley, Drs. Welton and Talbot, the oldest missionaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, despairing of consecration at the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and feeling that Episcopacy was absolutely needful to the existence of the Church in America, solicited and obtained consecration from a non-juring Bishop. On this being known, Dr. Welton was commanded on his allegiance to return, and Talbot was dismissed by the Society—Talbot, a man of wonderful nobility of soul, who would have been canonized in any other communion! A Bishop of London was bold enough to make one more attempt: he sent for a clergyman from Maryland to consecrate him his suffragan. The Government speedily quashed this design by serving Mr. Colbatch with a writ *ne exeat regno*.\*

\*NOTE.—Archbishop Secker writes, 1754: "We have done all we can here in vain, and so long as the Dissenters are uneasy and remonstrate, regard will be paid to them and their friends here by our Ministers of State."—Hawkins' *Mission* p. 392. Butler pressed the Government to allow the establishment of Episcopacy; he proposed in his fourth article that no bishop should be settled in places where the government was in the hands of Dissenters, as New England. This was pitiful. Happily for us, his plan was rejected.

What could men do against such determined opposition as this? We ascribe these acts to Walpole advisedly. Walpole would never brook an equal in his ministry, and George the First was ignorant of our language, laws, and constitution. Under a government so arbitrary and suspicious, ever fearing conspiracies and plots, all associations were regarded with jealousy; even those valuable organizations which had done such good work under Anne, and had been esteemed the very mainstay of the Church. In a few

favored spots they lingered yet a little longer, but throughout the country generally they were speedily dissolved. The Queen had been a warm supporter of these Religious Societies, and her Court, being favorable to virtue, had given a great impulse to such associations. The Court of George was, unhappily the reverse. The King could hardly stand forth as the upholder of virtue when his own palace was not without reproach.†

†NOTE.—Why persons should condone the conjugal infidelities of William III. and George we are at a loss to understand. William added cruelty to vice in his treatment of the Queen, and was so lavish of his gifts to his mistress that Parliament interfered. George the First installed the Duchess of Kendal in his palace; and in her apartments, for she was the incarnation of covetousness, the great offices of England were bought and sold. His cruelty to his Queen was matter of history.

And now the Latitudinarian school, so much encouraged, began to grow in power. We have seen that its evil leaven had long existed, but the Church, during the late reign, having been allowed liberty of action, which she had not scrupled to use, Latitudinarianism had made but little progress; and even now, owing to the teaching of the Creeds and Formularies, although there was a perceptible movement, its advance was, comparatively speaking, slow—so slow that the Church was regarded by a multitude of Nonconformists as a very Zoar of orthodoxy, a city of refuge to flee unto, from the destruction which threatened their own communities, from the Antinomianism and Arianism which was eating out the life of the sects. The Dissenting historian says that while "in the Established Church the effects were not very powerful," error was the destroying angel of the Dissenting congregations. Again, Socinianism was the abomination of desolation, and consigned what had formerly been houses of prayer and the assemblies of the saints, as an undisturbed abode to the spiders and the bats. Calamy declares that the heats among Dissenting ministers were perfectly scandalous, and that people weary of Dissent passed from the Presbyterians to the bosom of the Established Church. From all sides there was a large influx into the Church. Calamy mentions with amazement the names of more than thirty persons, men highly educated and some of great intellect, who at this juncture conformed; among these names we find Secker's and Butler's. It must have been more than sad to the earnest Churchmen of that day, that at such a crisis, with such an opening for gathering into one fold the great mass of the English people, the Church's arm was so miserably shortened, and this grand opportunity so wholly lost.

For a brief period the Church party had lived in hope that the influence of Walpole might wane, and certainly that the death of the King would bring about a change of ministry. Never were men doomed to more bitter disappointment. With the King's death, the shadows deepened. The Queen, who was omnipotent, became Walpole's fast friend; Dr. Clarke, the Arian (the Queen being an Arian), her favorite preacher and guide. Bitterly did Gibson lament the mischief this man wrought. Vice stalked abroad with brazen front, and Latitudinarianism in every form multiplied and prospered. Very many works issued from the press boldly attacking the doctrines of Christianity, especially that of the Trinity. The defenders were neither few nor weak, yet withal Unitarianism gained ground, and the year 1772 is made memorable by the presentation of a petition signed not only by lawyers and physicians, but by nearly two hundred and fifty clergy, asking to be relieved from subscribing to dogmas which they could not accept.‡

‡NOTE.—It would be impossible, in the space allotted, to enter into the Latitudinarian controversy. It extended through the whole century. We would briefly observe that Dr. S. Clarke impugned the doctrine of the Trinity, for which he was censured; Collins, 1714, endeavored to destroy the evidence of prophecy; Woolstan, 1727, the credibility of our Lord's miracles; Tindall extolled reason as a perfect guide. To these publications Tindall alludes: "In some late writing," he says, "public stews have been openly vindicated, and public vices commended to the protection of the Government as public benefits; great pains have been taken to make men easy in their vices, and to deliver them from the restraints of conscience by undermining all religion." Waterland, Bishop Pearce, Sherlock, etc., replied to these authors. Hume appears in the field 1738. Peter Annet ridiculed the resurrection, and was pilloried in 1762, the last who suffered for such an offence. The Liturgical Controversy commenced about