

The Church Times.

"Evangelical Truth--Apostolic Order."

VOL. X. DUBLIN, N. VA SCOTIA, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1857. NO. 36.

Calendar.

CALENDAR WITH LESSONS.

Date	MORNING.	EVENING.
S. Sept. 6	13 Sun. at Trin.	2 Kings 19
M. 7	Amos 9	7, 2 Kings 23
W. 8	Jonah 1	8, Obadiah 1
Th. 9	Jonah 2	9, Jonah 2, 3
F. 10	Micah 4	10, Micah 1
S. 11	Micah 2	11, Micah 3
S. 12	Micah 4	12, Micah 5
	Micah 1	13, Micah 7

Poetry.

HARVEST HOME.

[Music--Beethoven's "Trink Lied."]

Men of stave! hale and hearty,
Bravo at scythe and sickle, come,
Come and swell our gleesome party,
Reapers! sturdy reapers, come!
Time for all things, this for leisure;
Time for all things, this for pleasure.
Sing our merry Harvest-Home.

Mothers meek! home-tribles leaving,
Join your husbands' joy, and come,
Honour, love, respect receiving,
From the honest-hearted, come!
Nought unmeet for woman's bearing,
Nought unmeet for woman's hearing.
Blots our merry Harvest-Home.

Maidens modest! fear no roughness,
Fathers, brothers are we; come!
Kind and true, despite our bluntness;
Maidens modest! come, then, come!
Far away be thoughts of lightness,
With your own unsullied brightness,
Maidens! bless our Harvest-Home!

Aged folks! our hamlet's glory,
Dames and grandfathers!—all must come;
Come and tell again the story
Of the days long bygone, come!
Ye who with life's ills have striven,
And to whom now rest is given,
Welcome to our Harvest-Home!

Laughing children! lend your rattle
To our merry-making; come!
Good to hear is childhood's prattle:
Children! merry children, come!
Ye have worked us hard as others,
Gleaning proud beside your mothers,
Ye must share our Harvest-Home.

High and low! with one another,
Young and old! come, join us, come!
Each to each, in God, a brother;
To our village High-Day come!
Well it is that harvest labours,
Richly crowned, should bind all neighbours
In a thankful Harvest-Home.

—London Guardian.

Religious Miscellany.

THE DIVORCE BILL.

PERHAPS the most important matter of detail which remains for discussion in the Divorce Bill is the liability of the clergy to celebrate the marriages of divorced persons. The case stands thus:—Thousands of the clergy are convinced, first, that the present law of the land does not require, but forbids them to celebrate such marriages; and next, that they are directly prohibited by our Saviour; and this latter conviction, strictly theological in its grounds, is supported by such high theological authority that, whether just or not, it cannot possibly be dismissed as trifling. It is also in accordance with the existing law of the English Church.

No believer in Christianity can possibly deny that if the Legislature pass a law requiring these clergymen to celebrate marriages which in their opinion Christ has forbidden, it will be their duty to obey God rather than man, and to take the consequences whatever these may be. Every clergyman who announces that the marriages of divorced persons are, in his judgment, contrary to the express command of Christ, pledges himself beforehand, not knowingly himself to celebrate them, and therefore to take these consequences. Under these circumstances, half the clergy of England very naturally pray that, whatever facilities may be given for marriages of this class, they at least may not be required under penalties (compelled they cannot be) to affix a religious sanction to them.

What answer is given to this? A Dissenting member of Parliament has, we think, said that the

clergy are paid servants of the State, and, if they cannot find it in their consciences to do the State's work, they have only to quit their places. A doctrine virtually similar is now laid down by the Attorney General—with less vulgarity, perhaps, but even greater contempt of religious obligation:—

He hoped that the House of Commons would never listen for one moment to the desire of the clergy of the Church of England to be relieved from the obligation of obeying the law of the land. He could not conceive anything more dangerous, or anything that would be fraught with more unhappiness to the clergy and to the Church, than for the House to listen to those statements which are called conscientious scruples—and difficulties about the obligation of the clergy to obey the law of the land. Let them discuss the law, if they would, but when they had arrived at the conclusion that it ought to be the law of the land, let them require, without a moment's hesitation on the part of the clergy, obedience to that law. That was the true notion of the supremacy of the Crown.

These words should be written in letters of iron, and posted up in every parsonage, church, and curacy in the kingdom, to show those who are labouring for the good of the Church and nation what is the "true notion of the supremacy of the Crown," according to the solemn declaration of the principal law adviser of her Majesty. There is, indeed, a certain disingenuity about Sir R. Bethell's statement. The petition of the clergy is not that they may be relieved from the legal obligation to obey the law—which would be simply a contradiction in terms—but that a law may not be passed which it will be necessary for them to disobey—that their personal services may not be required for giving effect to an Act which they believe contrary to the law of God, and to which complete effect may be given without their aid. The question which the Attorney General is arguing is not the Executive question whether the clergy shall be practically allowed (as we imagine Roman Catholic Bishops are) to disobey, with impunity, a law standing on the statute book; but the Legislative question whether a Bill, imposing on them certain obnoxious and unnecessary duties, shall become law. It is at this stage of the proceedings, and to the Legislature, that the Attorney General urges that these so-called conscientious opinions have nothing whatever to do with the matter—that the House of Commons should "never for one moment listen" to them, but should simply enact its own opinions (on a theological question be it remembered), and require the clergy to give effect to them "without a moment's hesitation." "That," he adds, with a kind of triumphant satisfaction, "is the true notion of the supremacy of the Crown."

If it is, it will unquestionably effect in England more than all that an instalment of the "true notion" has effected in Scotland. It will call into existence, and that rapidly, one or more "free Churches," which will absorb all that is strong and healthy, either in the Catholic or Puritan elements of the existing Church, and will leave the Establishment a mere mass of endowment occupied by a few theorists calling themselves the Broad Church, and by a tame mass of indifference, equally neglected or disliked by Catholic, Puritan, and Liberal. How long such an inert block is likely to remain unplundered is hardly worth asking.—London Guardian.

BISHOP BLOMFIELD.

When in the summer of last year the able and distinguished Prelate whom we have named at the head of this paper retired from the active duties of the Metropolitan See, we availed ourselves of the occasion briefly to refer to his many and undoubted services to the Church, and to record our sense of the loss which she had sustained in being thenceforth deprived of them. Dr. Blomfield's lamented death, which took place on Wednesday last at Fulham, enables us now to dwell more freely on the merits, and invites us to review in greater detail the incidents and the results of his long and eventful Episcopate in the chief diocese of the English Church.

His career was eminently a practical one. With the exception of his Charges, a volume or two of Lectures and Sermons, and a Manual of Family Prayers, containing nothing remarkable by way of merit or demerit, Dr. Blomfield published nothing

whatever in the department of theology. And his scholarship, which had earned for him a reputation second only to that of the late Dean of Christ Church, Dr. Gaisford, and which, in his earlier life had displayed itself in his well known editions of some of the Plays of Æschylus, and in some other less important labors in the same line, became, after his elevation to the Bench, entirely subordinate to the real and important business of his life—the conduct of which might be not inaptly called, when in his hands, the Church business of the country.—It was, in short, his eminent capacity for what is usually called "business," which originally raised him, under the clear-sighted patronage, first, of Archbishop Howley, and then of the Duke of Wellington, from an obscure country parsonage to the administration of the See of London. And it was the same qualification, as it seems to us, which both constituted the principal merits, and led to the principal defects, observable in his Episcopate.

Dr. Blomfield's first step in life was, however, entirely his own. Going up to Cambridge, in 1804, from the grammar-school at Bury, his native place, he became, in 1808, Third Wrangler, and First Chancellor's Medallist, and ultimately obtained a Trinity Fellowship, on which he took orders, and was for some few years engaged in parish duty in the country. But shortly afterwards becoming chaplain to Dr. Howley, then Bishop of London, Dr. Blomfield's great abilities and wonderful energy and skill in the conduct of affairs became speedily apparent to that Prelate, and he was at once promoted to the important and lucrative living of Bishopsgate, London, which led, in the year 1825, to his elevation to the See of Chester, and in 1828 (at the age of forty-two) to that of London.

We have said that the merits, as well as the defects, of Bishop Blomfield's career are such as might have been expected from a man who was pre-eminently a man of business, and who took an almost exclusively practical view of all the duties and difficulties of his high and arduous position. And a detailed review of his Episcopate will, we think, completely bear out this remark. He achieved some few really great deeds. But they were all of an eminently practical character. His failures, on the other hand, were such as may, without unfairness, be traced to that excess of caution and absence of venture and enthusiasm which so pre-eminently distinguish what is called the practical man.

The two great deeds of Bishop Blomfield's Episcopate—and they deserve to be written on his tomb in letters of gold—are unquestionably the erection of the Bethnal-green churches, and the creation of the Colonial Episcopate.

We say the Bethnal-green churches; but the movement, originating in the Bishop's sense of the great church destitution observable principally in that district, became even at the outset metropolitan. It has resulted up to the present time in the erection and more or less complete endowment, of no less than 78 new churches in and near London, at a cost of more than half a million; independently of seven new churches, the entire erection and endowment of which by seven separate individuals—one being the Bishop himself—is wholly attributable to the impulse derived from the appeal made to the public on the first formation of the Metropolitan Churches Fund. This is a great achievement, and it will go down in history a lasting honor to Bishop Blomfield's name.

The Bishop's other great work, the creation, as it may almost be called, of the Colonial Episcopate, did not take place until the year 1840. At that time there were just five bishoprics of the English Church throughout the vast colonial empire subject to the English Crown. At the present time there are, we believe, no less than twenty-five, independently of six more now in course of foundation. And this result is due, under God's blessing, entirely to the energy and activity of Bishop Blomfield, exerted as it was, just at the opportune time, when people's minds had become prepared for this great and much needed reform, and when the principles to which the Bishop appealed were being universally discussed and developed, in consequence of the great Church movement then in progress, to which we have already referred.

These two are undoubtedly the works by which