

FOREIGN CHAPLAINCIES.

(From the London Chronicle.)

This is not the place to discuss under what circumstances English congregations may, without infringement of canonical order, be formed in places where another branch of the Church is settled, which refuses to admit English Churchmen to communion, except on conditions which they cannot accept. We take things as we find them. At the best English congregations abroad are, we admit, a theoretical anomaly; but immediate needs, must be satisfied. It is of little use to maintain, as Mr. Bennett has done, the utter unlawfulness of such congregations; because to say this is only a narrow and inadequate way of saying that the Church ought not to be divided. But, unhappily, it is divided; and it therefore becomes necessary—more necessary, if possible, in foreign countries than in England, that our congregations should show themselves to be of the Church, developing and acting on Church principles, and rigidly faithful to Church order. At home we have all sorts of safeguards against the Church being considered a mere department of civil government; but abroad we are misunderstood and misrepresented, and it is peculiarly important to show that our clergy are spiritual persons, acting under authority delegated by ecclesiastical superiors, and representing a Church and a Bishop.

The general practice, for at least two hundred years, has been that, wherever there is a British factory or consul, the Bishop of London should license a chaplain, with cure of souls, to the British residents. In the reign of George IV., when the State view of the Church of England was culminating, the Government, probably with the best intentions towards the Church—agreed that, whatever sum might be raised by English residents in foreign places, the Treasury would meet it with an equal amount, for a chaplain's stipend and for general Church purposes. But this concession was coupled with the condition that the chaplain, though he was "to be licensed by the Bishop of London, was only to hold office during his Majesty's pleasure"—or rather, during the pleasure of a Secretary of State. Sooner or later, that flaw in the system was sure to come out. In 1845 the famous Madeira case began. For some twenty years, Mr. Lowe, a clergyman of very distinguished powers, had resided in that island, ministering in peace and usefulness. He held the Bishop's license. Some of his congregation, chiefly Dissenters, picked a quarrel with him, petitioned the Foreign Secretary for his removal, stopped his salary, and ultimately got his appointment cancelled. But the Bishop of London did not withdraw his license. The Foreign Secretary, however, set the Bishop and his licensed chaplain at defiance, and appointed one Brown Government chaplain. Of course, this person had no spiritual authority—no license—no cure of souls—no communion with any Church on earth except that of Patriarch Palmerston. The result was the Madeira schism. One congregation clung to Mr. Lowe, because he held the Bishop of London's license; whilst the other clung to Mr. Brown, because he did not hold the Bishop's license—because he came out to Madeira purposely to erect a conventicle in opposition to the Bishop and his authority—because he gloried in the title of Government chaplain as opposed to that of Bishop's chaplain.

Here then, was a case involving the most fundamental principles. It embodied a dispute which has often occurred in the history of the Church. On the one side, is the nominee of the State, defying the Bishop—on the other, is the Church's minister fighting the Bishop's battle, defending the Bishop's mission, and making the largest sacrifices for the Bishop's authority. It would of course be superfluous to ask what side the prelate himself, whose jurisdiction and license were assailed, took in the matter. Equally superfluous would it be to enquire what re-arrangement of the Consular Act could alone satisfy the Bishop or vindicate the Church's spiritual power in giving mission. The Church could not acquiesce in anything short of an enactment declaring that the chaplain when once appointed, should be irremovable, except on the revocation of his license by the Bishop—this was surely the very least which a prelate

could insist on. But what was the course adopted towards Mr. Lowe and towards the faithful Churchmen in Madeira, by the Bishop of London? How did his lordship show his appreciation of the gallant stand which they had made, during seven years of distress and difficulty, in the vindicating his authority when it was set at nought, insulted, and contumeliously defied by Mr. Brown, and his patron, Lord Palmerston? The Bishop certainly did not withdraw Mr. Lowe's license; for he knew, not only the latter had committed no canonical offence, but that his only fault was conformity to the Prayerbook. But he actually offered—even while Mr. Lowe remained at Madeira, in possession of his own license—to license Mr. Brown, on Lord Palmerston's nomination. This offer Mr. Brown, at the Foreign Secretary's bidding, spurned. Although the Bishop, at an entire sacrifice of principle, was willing to whitewash Mr. Brown, this person refused to commune with the Bishop, and thus consummated and fixed his schism in the most daring manner.

At length Mr. Lowe accepts English preferment; and thus the obstacle which the Bishop had long wished out of the way is removed. Mr. Brown is prevailed upon by the Bishop to accept the license which he had formerly refused; and the prelate, it is announced, has, by this notable expedient "compromised" the question of foreign chaplains; but the episcopal license is only to be of force so long as the chaplain holds the appointment from the Secretary of State. And this we are told, is a "compromise." It is a naked, entire, and total surrender of the whole question. The Bishop binds himself hand and foot to allow himself, his license, and his chaplain, to be for ever under the absolute control of the Foreign-office. This is the most complete abandonment of the episcopal authority on record—the most direct and unqualified capitulation of Church principles to Erastianism. We must say it is no sin to fight the Bishop's battle. To vindicate his authority is the most certain way to incur episcopal desertion. If a clergyman openly defies the Bishop, he secures his submission; but if, on the other hand, a clergyman sacrifices health, peace, fortune, and preferment, in the Church's cause—especially in personal vindication of the Bishop himself—he and his cause are sure to be sacrificed in the end. In the case of the Bishop of London's famous charge of 1842, those of the clergy who yielded obedience to it were ostracised, whilst those who scouted its recommendations were at once submitted to. *Qualis ab ineptis*. The termination of the foreign chaplaincy dispute in 1852 is the exact repetition of what took place ten years ago with respect to conformity to the Prayerbook.

We have no wish to use harsh language, or to exaggerate the melancholy significance of this "compromise." But we will illustrate its inevitable working. Among the Foreign office regulations the money qualification remains. That is to say at a foreign station, a British subject, be he Jew, Roman Catholic, or Dissenter, may, by paying a certain sum, have a vote in all Church matters—in other words, a majority of persons who are not even in profession members of the Church of England, may at any moment dismiss the licensed chaplain. Such was actually the case at Madeira. And the Bishop of London has tied himself, in every such instance, to endorse such dismissal—he has pledged himself to withdraw a chaplain's license whenever it may happen, for example, that the British residents, or the majority of them in vestry or church meeting assembled, avow a conscientious dislike to the Apostles' Creed. We do not desire to pursue this topic further.

One reflection remains. We were told to expect great things in Church matters from a Protectionist Cabinet. The foreign chaplaincy question, in particular, was marked out as one in which the Church was sure to receive justice at the hands of Lord Derby's Government. The Whig tyranny was to be reversed and apologised for. Many Churchmen were so sanguine on this point that they based their confidence in the present Ministry on its satisfactory settlement. For ourselves, we were exposed to especial obloquy because we withheld such sweeping and anticipatory confidence; and our censors bade us wait for the adjustment of this question as a certain confirmation of our misgivings and suspicions. Yet,

after all, we were right. Lord Malmesbury has fixed that yoke on the Church which Lord Palmerston had failed to impose; and it will be among the most tangible proofs of the Churchmanship of the Derby Government that they have succeeded in extorting from the Bishop of London an entire surrender of the independence and authority of the Episcopate. Lord Palmerston's career was only a struggle with the Church; but Lord Malmesbury's tenure of office is already signalised by a complete and unqualified triumph over its principles.

FUNERAL RITES.

Mary.—May I say those verses, mamma, you gave me to learn.

Miss O.—Yes, do.

Mary.—

"Our mother, the earth hath a cradle bed,
Where she gathereth sure and sure,
And the old world's fathers are pillow'd there,
Her children every one;
And her cradle, it hath a dismal name,
In mirth or music's din;
And pale is the cheek at dance or wine,
If a song of its sleep break in.

But our mother, the Church, hath a gentle nest,
Where the Lord's dear children lie,
And its name is sweet to a Christian ear,
As a motherly lullaby;
O the green churchyard, the green churchyard,
Is the couch she spreads for all;
And she layeth the cottager's baby there,
As the lord of the tapestried hall.

Our mother, the Church, hath never a child
To honor before the rest,
And she signeth the same for mighty kings,
And the veriest babe on her breast;
And the bishop goes down to his narrow bed,
As the ploughman's child is laid,
And alike she bleaseth the dark-brow'd serf
And the chief in his robe array'd."

Miss O.—I thought of that when I saw Mrs. Temple's little baby brought to be buried. It had lived but an hour, and not even its father came to the funeral; there was only nurse Ware with the tiny coffin covered with white under her shawl. But the little creature was a member of Christ, and had a part in His Resurrection, and so the surplice was put on to meet it, and all the glorious chapter was read in full about the corn of wheat that must die, ere it be quickened.

Helena.—And the Church could do no more for her greatest! You know Maurice was at Eton when William IV. died, and the first hundred boys went to the funeral. He said it was so very grand and striking, the procession and all that; but you know all that the Church could do in honour of him was to have the Psalms chanted, and an anthem. And when it was all over, there came the heralds proclaiming his titles, and the wands of office being broken over the grave. It sounded, Maurice said, just as if they were proclaiming "vanity of vanities," dust and ashes, over again, showing how he could take nothing with him beyond the grave.

Audrey.—How beautiful the history is of Bishop Ken's funeral, in the dawn of the morning, and just as the sun rose, the little children beginning to sing, "Awake my soul."

Helena.—Did you know that mama had a sailor-brother, who died at sea? She says it gives her an especial feeling when she looks at the sea, as if it was his churchyard, so pure and deep, and grand; and she is so glad of that sentence in the prayer-book in the Forms of Prayer to be used at sea.

Audrey.—I read the other day, that the way a Christian's grave is to be known, is by the feet always being eastward.

Mary.—O yes, Old Master Grey always digs the graves the way of the church, east and west.

Helena.—The reason of that is, that they may rise and stand on their feet, when the Sun of Righteousness comes back, rising in the East.

Audrey.—How real that does make the looking for the Resurrection seem to us.

Helena.—Monuments show whether people thought much of the Resurrection or not.

Miss O.—Yes; the cross, the palm, were simple emblems in early times.

Helena.—The beautiful sleeping praying figures of the middle ages, with folded hands.

Audrey.—Till we come to those figures, angels crying over urns, and such things, as if angels had any reason to weep for the holy

dead! O, I do so wish I could get rid of that monument to old Lady Gertrude Morton; it used to make me so inattentive when I was a little girl!

Miss O.—I could make nearly the same confession, Audrey. In my time, it used to be thought the chief glory of our church, and I should have wondered if I had been told how I should dislike it.

Audrey.—It would have done just as well if she had been a heathen Roman!

Miss O.—But we are wandering from our subject. I was going to tell you of some of the beautiful funeral solemnities of the Greek Church. The cross is carried by a young child, and the corpse in its richest dress, is carried on an open bier.

Helena.—Ah! I have read of the wedding dress being kept to be worn at the funeral, with the bridal crown.

Audrey.—Or if a maiden dies she wears the dress of a bride; but that is in Italy.

Miss O.—I believe it is the same elsewhere. The crucifix is within the hands of the corpse, and the priests and mourners bear it to the Church, the service takes place and then, before the altar, a last kiss is given by the family. There is after this a prayer from all present, "Thou art the resurrection, O Christ!" and then the corpse is left for the night in the night in the church. The next day it is carried to the cemetery, and there, after the prayers, the nearest of kin kneels over the grave, and thrice calls aloud, "Come," as a summons in case any life should in truth be left, and when there is no reply, the priest covers the face with a veil, and scatters the earth on it, in the form of a cross, pronouncing, "The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof."

Audrey.—That is very beautiful.

Miss O.—Yes, it puts us in mind of the old name of our churchyards, God's Acre, as if the corpse there buried was the seed sown especially to rise up, as the Lord's own first-fruits of creation at His great harvest. The filling up of the grave is done by the mourners and spectators, each casting in a handful of earth, and saying, "It is well with thee, my brother."—*Monthly Packet*.

Advertisements.

DR. BOVELL,

John Street, near St. George's Church,
TORONTO.

Toronto, January 7th 1852.

23-1f

MR. S. J. STRATFORD,

SURGEON AND OCULIST,

Church Street, above Queen Street, Toronto

The Toronto Dispensary, for Diseases of the
EYE, in rear of the same.

Toronto, January 13th, 1837.

5-1f

J. P. CLARKE, Mus. Bac. K. C.

PROFESSOR OF THE PIANO-FORTE,

SINGING AND GUITAR,

Residence, Shuter Street.

Toronto, May 7, 1851.

41-1ly

T. BILTON,

MERCHANT TAILOR,

No. 2, Wellington Buildings,

King street Toronto.

Toronto, February, 1852.

27-1f

JOHN CRAIG,

GLASS STAINER,

Flag, Banner, and Ornamental Painter

HOUSE PAINTING, GRADING, &c., &c.

No. 7, Waterloo Buildings, Toronto.

September 4th, 1851.

6-1f

W. MORRISON,

Watch Maker and Manufacturing Jeweler,

SILVER SMITH, &c.

No. 9, KING STREET WEST, TORONTO.

NEAT and good assortment of Jewellery,
Watches, Clocks, &c. Spectacles, Jewellery
and Watches of all kinds made and repaired to order.

Utmost value given for old Gold and Silver.
Toronto, Jan. 28, 1847.

61

MR. CHARLES MAGRATH,

Barrister, Attorney, &c. &c.

OFFICE: Corner of Church and Colborne
Streets, opposite the side entrance to BRAND'S
Hotel.

Toronto, September 17, 1852.

1-1f