

now brought about. It was well known that Mr. Gladstone would not have the amendments of their lordships, and the temper which the members of the Upper Chamber exhibited in maintaining their amendments gave little promise of surrender on their part. When it was found on Saturday morning that the Lords had determined at their previous night's sitting to insist on their amendments being maintained, and, so to speak, flung down the gauntlet to the Commons, a sensation was caused throughout the country, for it is a parallel to which we should have to seek in the stirring times of the first Reform Bill. In the City, indeed, the excitement had reached a high pitch late on Saturday night. As the proceedings in the Upper Chamber became known in the clubs, the probabilities of the case were eagerly canvassed, and the wisdom of the course taken by the peers hotly debated. All sorts of rumours were abroad—that Mr. Gladstone would resign; the ancient expedient of a "free conference" would be resorted to; there would be an immediate dissolution of Parliament, and an appeal to the country; or that Mr. Gladstone would swamp the Upper House with new peers, and so get his measure passed through that Chamber. There had been a special sitting of Parliament convened for Saturday, to finish off the Bill, but the action of the gilded Chamber upset all the arrangements, and Mr. Gladstone announced that the matter would be adjourned till Monday, when he would make known his purposes.

On the assembly of the House of Commons last night great was the excitement. Mr. Gladstone was the centre of interest and the topic of conversation. Would he maintain a firm stand and not budge an inch, heroically defying the Lords to oppose him and his measure if they dare. The more extreme men of his party were for playing high jink with the Lords, and tried to draw out Mr. Gladstone, and induce him to make a statement threatening war *à outrance* with the upper or "Hereditary" Chamber, as the Radicals are so fond of calling it, with great emphasis on the adjective. But Mr. Gladstone never bore himself with a more statesmanlike mien. Evidently gauging the position correctly he saw that compromise was the wiser course, and acted upon it, giving way in some things entirely to the Lords, in others toning their amendments, but not entirely wiping them out. This course met with extreme opposition at the hands of some of the extreme ones in the House, but all wise and moderate men will praise Mr. Gladstone for his wisdom in thus doing his part to avoid a conflict with the House of Lords. I mail this before the Lords again review last night's work in the Commons, which they will do to-night. But there is not much fear but that they will accept the situation, and pass the measure as it now stands without any further delay, and thus make lawful a measure that has evoked more feeling and opposition than any one preceding it. To realize the excitement produced by this political crisis, now happily approaching the vanishing point, one must have resided in London, Nothing like it has occurred for many a year. It may be said to have culminated last night within the precincts of the House, and the approaches leading thereto. It is said that Mr. Gladstone received over 100 telegrams yesterday from the provinces urging him to maintain a firm stand and promising him the undivided support of his party in a conflict with the Lords. But this is happily averted, and those persons deserve the thanks of the country who have in any way contributed to that end.

Last week, a Bill was introduced in the House of Lords, entitled the "Ecclesiastical Courts Regulation Bill." Despite the comprehensiveness of the title, the course of the debate showed the object of the measure was a very simple one, and did not at all square with its title. This was evidently the view of the framers of the measure, who have since altered it to that of the "Release of Contumacious Prisoners Bill." In a few words, the purport of the Bill is to limit the imprisonment of contumacious offenders to six months, which would have the effect of releasing the Rev. Mr. Green, of Miles Platting, on the passing of the measure, avowed this to be his main object in framing the Bill, and was supported by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who said it would be a very great misfortune if conscientious men like Mr. Green should be imprisoned, he might say for life, on account of those conscientious opinions. The difficulty, however, he saw, was how a gentleman with such opinions was to be kept out of prison after he had been released. The Lord Chancellor, whilst condemning lawless clergymen, thought six months' imprisonment ample punishment for any contempt they might be guilty of. Lord Salisbury followed in the same strain, and as a result, the Bill has practically passed. It now remains for the Commons to find time to give their assent to the measure, when this gordian knot will have been cut, and it is to be hoped that such wise counsels will prevail as to prevent a repetition of this unseemly ecclesiastical scandal, out of which none who have been connected with it will come out with clean hands.

Dr. Pusey has written a characteristic letter to the Hon. C. L. Wood, which is printed in the *Times* of yesterday. The veteran, learned and reverend gentleman descants on Mr. Green's imprisonment, and compares that "rev. gentleman's case with his own. He says, that had his prosecutors been consistent, he would have been confined in gaol, and more deservedly so than Mr. Green. Dr. Pusey says he has always mixed water with the wine at the celebration, although the Prayer Book

is silent on the matter. He confesses that in his case a *prima facie* case existed for condign punishment of an unsupported offence. But in that of Mr. Green's, the case, he argues, is different, as he alleges Mr. Green has authority for all the practices for which he is punished.

The auspicious event, I, in a previous letter foretold, as being about to take place, has now been solemnized. The Duke of Argyll was joined in holy matrimony, on Saturday last, to the Hon. Mrs. Anson, widow of Col. the Hon. A. Anson, and daughter of the Bishop of St. Albans. The happy event was celebrated at Chelmsford, with the strictest privacy. The noble duke is 58 years of age, and has been a widower three years. The late duchess was supposed to have received the shock which caused her death by the burning of Inverary Castle.

Family Department.

"WATCH UNTO PRAYER."

BY A. F. W.

"Let your loins be girded about, and your lights burning; and ye yourselves like unto men who wait for their lord."

TEN virgins waiting in the darkness night. Ten virgins, with their lamps aglow and bright, Watching, expectant, by the door fast sealed. "Lest suddenly" the "Bridegroom" be revealed.

This shows the Church her holy work—her faith, Obedient to the word the Spirit saith. Alas, alas, that "five" should be unwise, "Five" only ready for the sweet surprise!

O foolish souls! In vain is watchful toil Among the virgins found, if without oil; In vain the outward form of holy ways, Except thy lamp give alms in golden days!

'Tis not enough to act the virgin's part— To walk a saint without a saintly heart; Kneel with devotion at the altar stair, And, turning, quench thy lamp in week-day glare.

Nor may'st thou borrow of thy neighbor grace, And enter thus within the holy place; Although the wheat and tares together grow, The golden grain discerning angels know.

Nay, thou must pray—pray oft and mightily; Though oft at church, still "oft" where'er thou be. Thus sanctify thy pleasure and thy toil, And get thine own pure stream of heavenly Oil.

For other virgins pray; lest, undevout And careless grown, and dull, their lamps go out. And pray for souls astray in the world's night, Without a ray to guide them to the Light.

Be steadfast, calm, and live above earth's cares, Thy prayers will keep thy watch—thy watch thy prayers; And when the bridegroom comes, when vigils cease, Thy lamp shall light the way to perfect peace.

H Y M N

Sung at the Laying of Christ Church, Albion Mines, Chancel Corner-Stone.

O LORD OF HOSTS, Whose glory fills The bounds of the eternal hills, And yet vouchsafes in Christian lands, To dwell in temples made with hands.

Grant that all we, who here today, Rejoicing this foundation lay, May be in very deed Thine own, Built on the precious Corner-Stone.

The heads that guide endow with skill, The hands that work preserve from ill, That we who these foundations lay May raise the topstone in its day.

SERMON BY CANON FARRAR ON ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY.

Canon Farrar preached at Westminster Abbey the following in a course of sermons on Disestablishment, taking as his text, Ps. cxxii. 6, 7. Having shown how much the country would lose by the disestablishment of the Church, he went on to give the following *resumé* of English Church history:—

"Glance with me, for a very few minutes, at English history, and you will see at once that the English Church and the English nation are, and always have been, one. There are but four great epochs of her history:—The British, the Saxon, the Mediæval and the Protestant, and for our purpose a few words only will be enough for each.

"1. First, the British period. Even the early British inhabitants of the island were converted to Christianity. I give up the fables that Christianity was preached in England by Joseph of Arimathea, or by St. Paul, 'The light of the world shone there, and we do not know who kindled it;' but even in the second century Britain was Christian. In the Diocletian persecution she had her martyr, St. Alban; and British Bishops attended (in A. D. 347) the Council of Arles, and introduced in very early days the Gallican liturgy.

"2. Then came the Saxon period. In the Saxon invasion Christianity for a time was trampled

out. The Saxons were Pagans. The British Christians were driven into Wales. You all know how the Saxon boys in the slave-market of Rome so moved the pity of Gregory that he said they would be 'not Angles but angels if they were but Christians.' You know how King Ethelbert was converted, and St. Augustine became first Archbishop of Canterbury: how King Edwin of Deira was converted, and how St. Paulinus became first Archbishop of York. The conversion of the nation followed the conversion of their Kings. The ecclesiastical organization grew up side by side with the political. There was not so much as any hint of a contract between Church and State. The Church and State were merely the people of England, fearing God and working righteousness. And mark, that at this and at all periods the Church of England was always a national and independent Church. She never was a mere branch of the Church of Rome. The British Bishops rejected Roman Supremacy; Saxon Bishops looked to Rome with respect, but not with subjection. Papal usurpation had not culminated. The Saxon Kings, whether great or small, had the undisputed appointment of the Bishops, and even ecclesiastical edicts were issued in their name with the authority of their Witan. Two things are certain. The Church of England never has been at any period, independent of the State, and never has been at any period under the dominion of usurping Rome.

"3. Then, after the Conquest, came her third or Mediæval epoch. Gregory VII, sanctioned the invasion of William of Normandy, and sent him a consecrated banner and a ring containing a hair of St. Peter. Why, because, as Mr. Freeman says, 'England's crime in the eyes of Rome—the crime to punish which William's crusade was approved and blessed—was the independence still retained by the island Church and nation. A land where the Church and nation were but different names for the same community—a land where priests and prelates were subject to the law like other men—a land where the King and his Witan gave away the staff of the Bishop, and a land which, in the eyes of Rome, was more dangerous than a land of Jews and Saracens.'

"Accordingly, when William had the Crown, the Pope promptly demanded two things as his share and the share of Rome—Peter's pence and fealty. But William was not the man to be degraded into the underling of an Italian priest. He granted the money, not as a right but as a benefaction; the fealty he absolutely refused. He forbade the clergy to recognize any Pope, to receive any brief, to promulgate any censure, to put in force any punishment, without his leave and approval. The virtues of Anselm, the murder of Becket, strengthened in part the Papal pretensions; and yet, after the infamous humiliation of John before the Papal legate at Dover, the clergy headed the barons and the people when they extorted from him the Great Charter at Runnymede. The Church and the nation were one at Runnymede, and were one in repudiating Papal interference. But the Great Charter, which all Englishmen have always regarded as a glorious bulwark of freedom, was described by the lowest of the Popes as 'a low, ill-favored, and disgraceful compact.' No wonder, for it breathes the spirit of defiance to Rome. So, when Boniface VIII. forbade Edward I to conquer Scotland, Edward simply defied him, and traced back his right to Scotland to the age of the Prophet Samuel and the English clergy decided for him against the Pope.

When the clergy, led astray by Archbishop Winchelsea, began to talk of their having two heads—the Pope and the King—Edward informed them, through the King's Bench, that they had thereby outlawed themselves, and they learnt to their cost what this implied. Again, when another Pope told Edward III. to submit to his pretensions and exactions, the King's bold answer was that 'if the Emperor, and the King of France to boot, both submitted, he would fight them both together, in defence of the liberties of England.' Again and again the Pope, aided by the monks, tried to subjugate England; again and again the secular clergy were loyal to the nation, and the nation protected its Church from being degraded by either of the three powerful instruments of Papal intrigue—either by foreign canons, or by legatine authority, or by monastic disloyalty—into an appanage of Romish priests. Church and nation were alike protected by four great bulwarks of civil law. The Popes, by their hold on the monasteries, tried to get the land into their grasp. They were defeated by the Statute of Mortmain. The Popes tried to get the appointments to religious dignities. They were defeated by the Statutes of Provisors. The Popes tried to set up an exclusive ecclesiastical jurisdiction. They were defeated by various acts of prohibitions. The Popes tried to establish a right of appeals to them against legal decisions. They received their severest rebuff in the Statute of *Præmunire*, which punished with outlawry any drawing out of the country of a plea which belonged to the King's court. Well might the Pope call it 'that execrable statute,' and a hideous encroachment; yet Archbishop after Archbishop declined to get it repealed. Henry V. suppressed foreign abbeys and imprisoned a Papal Nuncio. Even Queen Mary refused 'to enter into her kingdom, when the Pope sent him to supersede Cardinal Pole, and told the Pope that she was bound by her coronation oath to protect the rights to her crown and kingdom. Through those long centuries the Church of England was national,

and the Church of England was independent of all foreign control.

"4. Then, lastly, came the Reformation. It is convenient for Romanists to sneer at it; to talk as though 'Gospel light first shone from Boleyn's eyes; to say that it was only determined by the lusts and caprices of Henry VIII; to speak with costumely of the Marian martyrs. It is a strange and painful sign of the time that there are now English clergymen who do the same. But history refuses to return their own echo to these violent voices. The Reformation in England, like all human events, great or small, religious or secular, was mixed up with many sins and weaknesses; but through them all we see God's will at work. Of all preposterous scoffs the most foolish is that which asks 'where our religion was before Luther.' The simple answer is that it is where it has always been—on the pages of the Gospels and in the creeds of Christendom. A golden censer does not cease to be a golden because it is cleansed from its dust and purged of its alloy; nor does a Church cease to be a Church, by sweeping away the dence and darkening accumulations of ignorance and error. There was in England a twofold Reformation—political in the reign of Henry VIII., religious in the reign of Edward VI. Neither of these was one act, but many acts, obeying a great stream of tendency. Neither was new in principle. When, in 1533, Parliament declared, 'The Crown of England is imperial, and the nation is a complete body within itself, with a full power to give justice in all cases, spiritual as well as temporal,' it did but reaffirm statues as old as the Plantagenets, the Normans, nay, even the Saxon King.

"So far was the condition of Church and nation from being reversed by the Act of Supremacy that it left 'the same Bishops, the same courts, the same churches, the same Sacraments, the same Liturgy, the same recognized union between Church and State.' And how childish is the notion that a boy like Edward VI. could altar the religion of England. The influences of the Reformation in Germany had breathed upon England as the dawn breathes upon the darkness, and the spring wind breathes upon the frost. Germany was paying back, in the influence of Luther, what she had first gained from the influence of Wicliffe. Had there been no reformers in England before the Reformation? Had not Wicliffe in the fourteenth century, as distinctly as if he had lived in the sixteenth, abjured the Pope's supremacy, and declared it to be the duty of the clergy to pay taxes to the State? Had not Richard Grossetete, the great Bishop of Lincoln, in the thirteenth century flatly refused the demand of Innocent IV. to induct his nephew, a mere Italian child, into a canonry of Lincoln? Had not the English Bishops at the council of Constance signalized themselves by their stern abhorrence of Pope John XIII?

And as for Church and State, the Reformation did but continue their conjoint and blended action. It neither introduced Erastianism nor sanctioned priestcraft. The epitome of the Reformation in England is simply this—That the nation repudiated more distinctly than before a false scheme of ecclesiastical unity; and in so doing repudiated also the false accretions to religious doctrine."

INCONSISTENCY OF CHURCHMEN.

Strange it is, that Church parents will strengthen the cause of papacy in the land. Is it asked how? We reply by sending their children to Romanish schools to be educated. Is it that they value education more and pure undefiled religion less, that they will patronize institutions where, though the ostensible object be attention to the former, a powerful, secret, indirect influence is put forth to increase the devotees to a most corrupted form of Christianity,—a form, too, built for the most part upon "the traditions" of men, and utterly variant in many things in letter and spirit, with the plain directions of the Founder of our faith! Or is it that there are no seminaries of learning in our land under the direction of Churchmen and women, where our children can receive as good an education as they can elsewhere? This cannot be admitted. Churchmen must not believe it. Let them not be cajoled by the vaunting declaration that there are no good schools in our country save those that are under the management of the opposers of Church principles. Let them inquire of Churchmen. Let them not suppose that because a *Romanist* seminary "has acquired a reputation," there are none others equally good conducted by *Churchmen*, anywhere to be found. Let them take warning from the facts, and they are not few, which are frequently elicited, in reference to the religious, or rather sectarian influence that is brought to bear upon the young and susceptible mind of the former, and not lend themselves to build up, in this country, what is manifestly becoming weaker in the country of its first erection—a popedom; in other words, an ecclesiastical establishment that would bring under its control the very government of the country, and allow us only such a conscience as would uncomplainingly respond to the degrees of the Roman Church, a college of cardinals, the mandate of a sovereign pontiff.—*Old Church Porch.*

WHAT does being baptized into Christ's Death mean? That it is with a view to our dying as He did. For Baptism is the Cross. What the Cross then and Burial is to Christ, that Baptism hath been to us. And if thou hast shared in Death and Burial, much more wilt thou in Resurrection and Life.—*S. Chrysostom.*