

placing inquisitors,¹ who had been murdered in the work of burning heretics, as, for example, Peter Arbues and the inquisitors of Avignonet, among the saints, and canonizing them. The simultaneous canonization of Archbishop Josaphat Kuncevicz, whom the Greeks that he had persecuted and robbed of their churches had murdered, was intended to serve the same purpose. With a keen eye to the end in view, several smaller councils also were made to precede the grand main act in Rome. Suddenly and unexpectedly commands from Rome had ordered the holding of provincial councils. Such were held at Cologne, Prague, and Colocza in 1860, at Utrecht in 1865, at Baltimore in 1866. Those who took part in them were bound to the strictest secrecy; the results of their deliberations were sent to Rome, came back from thence revised and corrected, and soon it was shown that these were compendious statements of dogma, just such as are found in a hundred school-books; and in many cases the Tridentine decrees and the like had been merely copied. The world wondered that so simple a business, which might well have been left to the nearest Jesuit or the best teacher in the nearest theological college, should be thought to require the immense expenditure of time and costly apparatus necessary for a provincial synod. But the riddle was soon solved when, as the Jesuits forthwith triumphantly made prominent, all with wonderful unanimity taught the dogmatic Infallibility of the Pope.

In the convictions expressed in this article Dr. Döllinger died. About the character of the Vatican Decrees he never wavered. No Old Catholic could be more profoundly convinced than he was that to accept them meant, for Roman clergy, a violation of their ordination vow, and for every well-instructed person, adhesion to what could be proved to be a lie.

ALFRED PLUMMER.

ART. III.—JOHN SINCLAIR, ARCHDEACON OF MIDDLESEX.

THE life of John Sinclair, Archdeacon of Middlesex, coincided with the period when the National Church of England had almost sole control of the elementary education of the country. It covers also that great period of the development of Church life which began with the publication of the "Tracts for the Times," at Oxford. As he was secretary and treasurer of the National Society for upwards of thirty years, and held the Archdeaconry of Middlesex from 1842 to 1875, his work in both respects gave him great influence. Archbishop Tait wrote of him and of the peculiar position which he occupied in the greatest diocese in Christendom, that he was the trusted friend of Bishop Blomfield, and had the same

¹ See the "Report of the Reunion Conference at Bonn," 1875, p. 46, English translation. Pickering. 1876.

indomitable industry and perseverance as his chief, and was devoted to the same good works which have made Bishop Blomfield's episcopate ever memorable; adding that, as he distinctly and calmly marked out for himself what he thought the proper course, both in practical Church government and in matters of speculation, he was never swayed by the persuasions of others, and had no temptation to give encouragement against his better judgment to any fancies amongst those with whom he was thrown. The Archbishop points out how useful such a character was amid the difficulties of his age. Innovations were rife on all sides. The Church of England, thoroughly awakened from the torpor of the past generation, was subjected to a variety of experiments, according to the zeal and caprice of those who rejoiced in its new vigour. The noble and somewhat impetuous character of Bishop Blomfield was well suited to foster the signs of rising life; but the calm, shrewd intellect of the Archdeacon, trying all things according to their real merits, and by the test of a sound logic, was an invaluable assistant in those days of excitement. Archdeacon Sinclair was quite as capable as his chief of reading the signs of the times; he saw where change was indispensable, and was quite ready to accommodate himself to the wants of the age; but he never gave way from mere impulsiveness.

The two great practical duties to which he gave his official life may be said to have been the adjustment of national education on such a religious basis as was suitable to the changed circumstances of the times, and the forwarding of that work of Church extension on which his Bishop had chiefly concentrated the energies of his great mind.

Few, perhaps, of the present generation recognise how much the country owes to Archdeacon Sinclair in the matter of religious education. His attention was turned to this subject at a time when many vague theories were afloat, and there was great danger lest the National Church might lose that influence over the education of the poor which, he saw, must constitute its chief claim to the confidence of the nation in the difficult times that were approaching. It is not too much to say that to the Archdeacon and those who worked with him, and to the wise compromise which they effected with the Government of the day, we owe that wonderful advance in the religious education of the poor which we would fain hope has secured the allegiance of the nation to Christian as opposed to mere secular teaching, and enables us to look forward in comparative security, even to the greatest changes which may possibly befall us in the outward organization of our public educational arrangements.

When we pass through the country, and see church schools

newly erected in every district, when we read of the extraordinary sums which the clergy, out of their poverty, and the Church laity have contributed to the cause of religious education, and even when we think of the former efforts of Dissenting communities to vie with the Church in this good work, it would be wrong not to remember gratefully how much we owe—I am still adopting the language of Archbishop Tait—to the sound sense and indomitable perseverance of him who was first secretary of the National Society, and afterwards Archdeacon of Middlesex during the years of that crisis when the English nation was first awakened to appreciate, even imperfectly, the great responsibilities of the State in the education of the poor.

John Sinclair was one of the numerous family of the well-known Scotch statesman in the reign of George III., the Right Hon. Sir John Sinclair, M.P., of Thurso Castle, Caithness, founder of the Board of Agriculture, and author of "The Statistical Account of Scotland," and between 300 and 400 other financial, political, social, and economical works. Sir John had inherited the vast estates of the ancient earldom of Caithness, in that county, which had been carefully nursed during a long minority by the shrewd energy of his mother, Lady Janet Sutherland, of Dunrobin Castle; but travelling in those days was so difficult, and Sir John was so occupied with his Parliamentary duties, that his family were chiefly brought up in Edinburgh and at Ham Common, near London. Sir John was an indefatigable philanthropist, and promoter of all schemes of agricultural progress, and had impressed upon all his family the duty of public spirit and of devotion to the commonwealth. He was somewhat deficient in humour, and his indefatigable energy occasionally led him into situations which would have been disagreeable to a man with more tact and reserve; and to this fact we must trace the shy, retiring, and reserved nature of the Archdeacon. The mother, of whom all her children always spoke in the warmest terms of respect and affection, was the Hon. Diana Macdonald, only daughter of Lord Macdonald (of the Isles), twenty-fifth chief of the principal part of the clan Macdonald. Lady Sinclair's children were lastingly indebted to Sir John's eldest daughter by a former marriage, Hannah Sinclair, a lady of great powers of mind and earnest religious feeling, who impressed upon each of them at a very early age the fear of God and a strong sense of duty. She wrote a letter on "The Principles of the Christian Faith," which had a preface by Hannah More, and was widely read at the beginning of the century.

John Sinclair was to some extent adopted by his unmarried

uncle, Alexander, second Lord Macdonald. He studied at Edinburgh University, and afterwards went to Pembroke College, Oxford, where he took his degree, as what was then called a Grand Compounder. At Edinburgh he was the chief means of forming what was known as the "Rhetorical Society," among the members of which were the late Earl of Wemyss, the late Adam Anderson (afterwards the judge Lord Anderson), and David Robertson, who was created Lord Marjoribanks. When he was at Oxford he proposed a similar society, but the Dons frowned upon him and prevented it. The project was renewed some years after, when the "Oxford Union Club" was formed, of which John Sinclair's younger brother William was one of the early presidents.

After travelling for some time with his uncle, in 1820 he was ordained by the Bishop of Lincoln to the curacy of Stanford, of which he has printed some amusing reminiscences. He was also curate to Archdeacon Norris at Hackney, and it was here that occurred the closing scene of the well-known children's book "Holiday House," by his sister, Catherine Sinclair, in which his younger brother James, the "Frank" of the story, comes home from military service in India to die. James was buried in the churchyard at Hackney. John Sinclair was shortly afterwards appointed to St. Paul's Episcopal Chapel, Carrubbers Close, Edinburgh, where he remained till he became a colleague to the Rev. Archibald Alison, of St. Paul's Church, York Place, in the new part of that town. In his book of reminiscences called "Old Times and Distant Places," the Archdeacon has given an interesting sketch of Mr. Alison. No one who attended old Kensington Church, or who heard the Archdeacon read family prayers, can fail to remember the wonderful reverential dignity of his voice and manner. It was like a strain of serene and solemn music, and it was to a considerable degree to Mr. Alison that he owed this great gift. He quotes himself from Mr. Lockhart, of the *Quarterly Review*, a description of Mr. Alison's reading :

I have never heard any man read the service in our church in so fine a style as Mr. Alison. The grave, antique majesty of those inimitable prayers, acquiring new beauty and sublimity as they passed through his lips, could not fail to refresh and elevate my mind. In his preaching the effect of his voice is no less striking, and, indeed, much as you have read and admired his sermons, I am sure you would confess after once hearing him that they cannot produce their full effect without the accompaniment of that delightful music.

During this period of his life Mr. Sinclair resided with his father and mother at the family town house, 133, George Street, which was for half a century one of the most hospitable centres in Edinburgh society. While living in Edinburgh he attended the history classes of the celebrated metaphysician

Sir William Hamilton, and became an intimate friend and correspondent. Nothing could have been more delightful or instructive than Edinburgh society at this period. As one of the most trusted of the episcopal clergy, John Sinclair had an opportunity of observing it on all sides. In 1820 he became a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and in this capacity he and Dr. Abercrombie, the writer on moral philosophy, were appointed to examine the letters and correspondence of David Hume, the philosopher and historian, on which Mr. Sinclair drew up a very interesting paper. In 1828 he became acquainted with Dr. Thomas Chalmers, who had become Professor of Divinity in Edinburgh University. He attended his first course of lectures, and describes the intense interest with which he and other students listened to the Professor's discourses. The salary of the Professors was only at that time £200 a year, and at the end of his first course Mr. Sinclair persuaded the other students to join with him in presenting Dr. Chalmers with an equal sum. In 1839, at the age of 42, he went to London to a celebrated oculist about a weakness of the eyes which troubled him throughout the whole of his life. While he was there a vacancy occurred in the post of secretary to the National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Church of England. While curate to Archdeacon Norris, Mr. Sinclair had become acquainted with his brother-in-law, Joshua Watson, one of the founders of this great institution. While forbidden to receive visitors under the effects of his operation, Mr. Watson, treasurer of the society, insisted upon seeing him. He introduced at once the subject of elementary education, spoke of the very serious difficulties which had arisen between the National Society and the newly constituted Committee of Council on Education. The Rev. J. C. Wigram (afterwards Bishop of Rochester) had resigned his office as secretary, and the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Howley), the Bishop of London (Dr. Blomfield), and himself, as treasurer, had been empowered to choose a successor. He ended by wishing that Mr. Sinclair would undertake the duty. Mr. Sinclair expressed himself with his usual caution; but a few days afterwards Mr. Watson returned, saying that he had been both to Lambeth and to Fulham, that the Archbishop would feel relieved from a serious difficulty if he would accept the vacant post, and the Bishop of London, in proof of his favourable disposition, was ready to appoint him one of his examining chaplains. To these representations he yielded; and thus was formed an official connection which lasted no fewer than thirty-two years.

The first education grant was voted by Parliament in 1830;

the whole amount was only £20,000 a year. Ten shillings was the sum allowed for each child provided with school accommodation, and the grants were given on the recommendation of the National Society or the British and Foreign School Society. The latter, although not decidedly a Nonconformist institution (for the managers and teachers might be of the Church), enabled Nonconformists to obtain a share of the public bounty. The arrangement had lasted ten years, when the Lords of the Treasury were superseded by a Committee of Privy Council, who undertook to distribute £30,000 a year on their own responsibility, and with the same regard to the recommendations of the two societies. It is singular in these days to read how the mode in which the new committee spoke and acted excited at that time general alarm throughout the Church. It was the inspection of schools by a Government official which was at that time such a startling innovation. The State inspector, never sanctioned nor directed in any way by the authorities of the Church, was to have the right of entering schools, and, without inquiring into the religious education of the pupils, was to examine and report on their secular attainments. The declared object of his visit was to secure conformity to the regulations and discipline established in the several schools, with such improvements as might from time to time be established by the Committee of Council.

As State inspection was a novelty, and as the form it assumed seemed liable to serious objection, applications poured in on the new secretary for advice whether the clergy should submit to the required condition or reject the grant. They were impatient for an immediate answer, being called upon to accept or reject the Government subsidy within a period which would soon expire. The committee of the National Society had fixed their next meeting for a day after the date when the answer must be given, and the members were scattered all over the kingdom. What was the secretary to do? With great courage he drew up a private circular, advising the applicants to ask the Privy Council for further time, in order that, before returning a final answer, they might consult the National Society. As soon as the circular was set up in type, he hurried with a proof to Fulham Palace to consult the Bishop of London. His reception was very characteristic. Mr. Sinclair found the Bishop seated quietly at dinner with his family. He asked him to take a chair, as if he had been an invited guest, discussing a variety of subjects with perfect coolness; and then, as soon as the ladies were gone, began abruptly: "Something of moment must have brought you here at this hour. What is it?" Mr. Sinclair explained, and presented the circular. Having read it, Bishop Blomfield

gravely said: "It is a bold beginning of your secretaryship to issue an unauthorized circular affecting the relation of the society to the Government; and yet I cannot advise you to suppress it."

The circular produced the favourable result anticipated. On the 16th October, 1839, when the committee assembled, with Archbishop Howley in the chair, Mr. Sinclair was able to say that if they should wish to recommend the clergy to decline public grants until the obnoxious clause was withdrawn, he had already ascertained that a very large majority were prepared to risk the loss. This course was followed, and out of 204 schools applying for public aid only 49 accepted it; and of that small number 14 afterwards declined it. The feeling in the country was very strong. A second circular was shortly issued by the Archdeacon to strengthen the resolution of the friends of the Church, with the approbation of Lord Ashley and Bishop Blomfield. A committee was also formed to raise money, which had its headquarters in Leicester Square, with Lord Ashley as chairman. Its moving spirit was Mr. Matheson, chief assayer at the Mint. He had a large staff of clerks, and availed himself without stint of the penny post, then recently established, to issue circulars by tens of thousands. He was the first to adopt on a large scale the new facilities thus afforded for letters. The result was highly satisfactory; no fewer than 15,310 promises of help were obtained. As the liberality of the upper classes is sometimes impugned, it may be worth while to mention that this number included 789 of the nobility and landed gentry, and 4,099 clergymen. Mr. Sinclair was desirous to obtain the support of the Universities, and in the case of Oxford he found a favourable opportunity. His friend Dr. Shuttleworth (afterwards Bishop of Chichester) was Vice-Chancellor, and he prevailed on him, although a Whig, to give him an opportunity of preaching from the University pulpit. Announcements were made in all the colleges and throughout the city that the secretary of the National Society was to give a sermon on the critical state of elementary education. No small excitement was created. St. Mary's was crowded not only with undergraduates, but with Masters of Arts and Heads of Houses. The result far exceeded Mr. Sinclair's most sanguine hopes. His friend, Mr. Philip Duncan, of New College, made a good beginning by coming to the college with a contribution of £100. The University unanimously voted £500 for the society, and not long after the University of Cambridge, with the same unanimity, voted £300. It was on this occasion that Mr. Greswell exerted himself in the generous and energetic manner which is so well described by Dean Burgon in his "Twelve Good Men";

but Dean Burgon does not record the origin of the movement.

It was hoped that Parliament would be induced at any rate to consider the wishes of the Church; but, as usual, the important responsibilities of national religious education were ill-understood, even by the friends of the Church. Sir Robert Inglis, Mr. Goulburn, and Mr. Colquhoun declined to bring the subject of national education forward. They told the society that Church education was not the first business to be attended to, but rather Church extension. But Sir Robert Inglis's proposal for grants of money for the building of churches was laid aside as impracticable, and the opportunity was lost. The Committee of Council, however, began to understand better the position of the National Society. They had underrated the strength of the Church, and also its sincerity in the cause of secular instruction. The secretary of the Committee of Council at this time was Dr. Kaye (afterwards Sir James Kaye Shuttleworth), who was not only able and energetic, but reasonable. Before long a way was opened for mutual understanding. Mr. Sinclair was one day walking in Oxford Street, when he met an old college friend, Sir Henry Thompson, whom he had supposed to be dead. Sir Henry inquired why he was so hostile to the Committee of Council. He had heard of the state of affairs from his brother-in-law, Dr. Kaye, and his friend, Sir George Grey. Mr. Sinclair replied: "I am a man of peace, and shall be obliged to you to convey this message to Sir George Grey and Dr. Kaye: 'If you will give us full security for the religious education of the people, we shall give you full security for their secular instruction.'" Negotiations began with the Government. It now became necessary to convince Archbishop Howley of the wisdom of a compromise. Mr. Sinclair was summoned to Lambeth, when he found the Primate complaining that he was only to have a veto on the appointment of inspector. Mr. Sinclair showed him that he had a concurrent right of recommendation, and if he withdrew his approval the inspector was, *ipse facto*, deprived. With regard to Church schools, he was himself to draw up the instructions to inspectors on the subject of religious knowledge. The Archbishop was satisfied, and authorized him to go to the Bishop of London. Bishop Blomfield was setting out in his coach, with court liveries, to attend a christening at which the Royal Family were to be present; but Mr. Sinclair jumped into the carriage, and explained the matter as they drove along. The Bishop of Salisbury, who was a Whig, was the intermediary with the Government. To him Mr. Sinclair hastened, and on the 10th August, 1840, the concordat was signed at Buckingham Palace. The success

and popularity of the concordat throughout the country was complete; and the Archbishops of Canterbury and York proposed to appoint Mr. Sinclair secretary to both for education. An objection, however, was raised at the office of the Privy Council, and their friendly intentions were not realized. Joshua Watson was one of the few who disapproved of the concordat, and he resigned the treasurership in consequence. The fact that Mr. Sinclair was appointed to succeed him in that office while he still held the office of secretary shows the immense amount of authority which he had already acquired.

In the year 1843 Mr. Sinclair, who as much as his father, Sir John, merited the title of "the indefatigable," was called on to undertake important pastoral work. Bishop Blomfield appointed him Vicar of Kensington, and in the following year Archdeacon of Middlesex. The population of that new suburb had already greatly outgrown the means of public worship, although it was still separate from London, and it was rapidly increasing. So he set himself to work with constitutional vigour and enthusiasm for the work of Church extension. He remained Vicar and Archdeacon for the last thirty years of his life. When he came into the district there were only three parishes and churches—the hideous old red-brick "William III." edifice of St. Mary Abbott's, and the more modern churches of St. Barnabas and Brompton. Before the close of his career he had been the means of subdividing it, with equal wisdom and disinterestedness, into twenty-three parishes, with upwards of thirty churches. As well as being secretary and treasurer of the National Society, he was also secretary of the Diocesan Church Building Society of Bishop Blomfield, which was afterwards replaced by the Bishop of London's Fund of Dr. Tait. This office gave him great opportunities, not only in his own vast district, but in all parts of London, of pursuing with the utmost zeal the work not only of providing the growing masses of the people with schools, but also with those means of worship which, for the most part, they were unable to provide for themselves. The Metropolitan Churches Fund had been inaugurated by Bishop Blomfield in 1836. By the 20th June, 1837, the day of the Queen's accession, it had received in money and promises £117,423. Two years later, out of this earlier association arose an offshoot, the Bethnal Green Churches Fund, promoted by Mr. William Cotton; and in 1854, when it had by that time raised £266,000, it was transformed into the London Diocesan Church Building Society. The Church Building Society issued an appeal in May, 1854, the Queen heading the list of subscriptions with £500. Working with Archdeacon Sinclair were his friends, the Rev. J. Stooks and the Rev. W. D. Maclagan, who, after his death,

succeeded him as Vicar of Kensington, and afterwards became Bishop of Lichfield. During the nine years that followed, the society raised £65,000 to promote the erection of fifty churches in the Diocese of London. At the end of that time the action of the society was to a great extent superseded by the Bishop of London's Fund. During all these years the vicarage of Kensington was the resort of anxious clergymen and laymen who were eager for the erection of churches, and who were always welcome to the wise and fatherly advice of the Archdeacon. In the account of his friendship with the celebrated Dr. Chalmers, John Sinclair relates the hint which he received on the last occasion that he saw that great and excellent man. It was in the year 1843. He had been telling the Doctor of what he was doing for the support and extension of the Church of England National Schools, and, in particular, how he had received promises of support from hundreds of influential people, including members of the Cabinet and both Houses of Parliament. "Dr. Chalmers," he said, "heard me patiently for some time, and then replied, 'Mr. Sinclair, I perceive you are an enthusiast. Your National Society must, under God, depend upon the nation for support, and not on Cabinets or Parliaments.'" Mr. Sinclair threw himself heartily upon the general opinion of the National Church in the public meetings which he resorted to when he wanted to raise money or to influence public opinion. He never spoke from a platform himself, for after leaving the University he lost the fluency of speech which he had acquired there; but he had the most remarkable tact in arranging public meetings and providing speakers who were likely to be listened to. On one of these occasions Mr. Thackeray had recently come to live in Kensington, and the Archdeacon thought his name would be a powerful attraction. He called upon him. Thackeray was unwell, and in his bedroom. The Archdeacon having sent up his card, Thackeray came downstairs, when Mr. Sinclair explained his object. Thackeray at once declined, saying he had never in his life made a speech on a platform, and that he only wrote for the public, and, besides, he was too ill to leave the house. Mr. Sinclair said he would not insist on a speech, but that it was very difficult to get up a meeting in Kensington, and that if Mr. Thackeray would only allow his name to be printed on the handbills he would not insist on his saying anything, and would have the speaking done by others. Mr. Thackeray was amused, and said: "Well, if I am alive I will come to your meeting." The handbills were accordingly issued with Thackeray's name on them. A great crowd assembled. Mr. Thackeray appeared on the platform. He found that when there he could not avoid saying something. His words

were few but telling, and they were received with enthusiasm. Mr. Sinclair adds that this was the only time when the rhetorical powers of the great novelist were proved at a public meeting.

Besides all these important public labours, a hint of which only can be given in a brief magazine article, Archdeacon Sinclair's influence with the clergy and Church was greatly increased by the long series of his important Charges, which were collected in 1886, after his death, by Messrs. Rivington, with a preface by Archbishop Tait, and an historical introduction by the Archdeacon's learned friend Canon Jenkyns, of Lyminge. This series forms a very interesting contribution to the ecclesiastical history of the thirty important years of his archidiaconate. Archdeacon Sinclair's style was terse and epigrammatical, and brimming over with suppressed humour; and the width and breadth of his learning made the occasions of their delivery at St. Paul's, Covent Garden, an interesting event to all his clergy. The first Charge, in 1844, was naturally largely occupied with the position at that time of National Education. He was able to state that National Schools alone had within the last four years increased from 6,778 to 10,087, and the number of scholars for whom accommodation was provided from 587,911 to 875,194, or at the rate of 71,820 a year. He also took occasion to make a statement of reasons against making all sittings in churches free and unappropriated, the wisdom of which subsequent experience has made abundantly clear. At that early period he was also warning the clergy that prayers against unhappy divisions must be practical, that there must be a general diminution of party jealousies, a general desire through the great body of the Church, the laity as well as the clergy, to prevent innovations, to maintain inviolate the standards of faith and worship handed down by our forefathers, and to transmit these uncorrupted and unmutilated to our posterity.

The Charge of 1845 was occupied again with National Education, the history of ruri-decanal chapters, and the interpretation of the rubrics. At a date twenty-four years before the Act of Mr. Forster, and with a view to the controversy of the present day, the Archdeacon's anticipations of School Boards are highly instructive. He is speaking of the important wish of many persons to supersede all voluntary efforts, whether of individuals or associations, by parochial or general assessments, and a Board of Public Instruction.

These persons (he says) direct their eyes to foreign countries, where education is in the hands of the Government, and where the machinery for conducting it can be established at will; and they complain that England should be an exception to the rule. They forget that neither France, Russia, Holland, nor Lombardy, can furnish in this respect a

precedent of any value to Great Britain. They forget that in all of them the Government does everything, and the clergy and people comparatively nothing. Nor do such persons sufficiently consider that the present divided state of religious opinion throughout this country, and the little ground we have to hope that a Board of Public Instruction would be able or disposed to maintain the schools, over which the clergy should have their proper influence, and in which Christianity should be taught fully and unreservedly without compromise or mutilation.

With regard to ruri-decanal chapters, he pointed out that, although voluntary associations of the clergy for mutual counsel were frequent and well known, it was to Bishop Blomfield and the Archdeacons of the diocese that the revival of the ancient system was owed.

With regard to the interpretation of the rubrics, he pointed out that leanings either to Rome or Geneva must be rightly held as a disqualification for ever in the Church of England. He warned the clergy against the danger of party badges, however small. He recommended to them as their proper object the reconciliation of usage with regulation; he spoke of custom as the best interpreter; and he insisted that the minister could never be the judge of disputed points. He reminded them of the significance of disuse, and that as the legislative functions of the Church had been for generations in abeyance, the only way in which she could express her will, that a form or ceremony should fall into disuse, was by actually disusing it. He was very keenly averse to any appeal whatsoever either to the law or to legislation.

It is easy (he said) to conceive the general turmoil, the strife, the jealousy, the exasperation likely to follow any legislative interference with our existing arrangements. All that we are sure of is contention; the changes we intend to urge may be rejected, while those we mean to strive against may be forced upon us; and whether we succeed or fail in carrying out our favourite schemes, we may find occasion to grieve over the irreparable injury of schism and separation which, with no evil intentions, we have done our utmost to inflict.

In the year 1846, instead of charging himself, he preached at the visitation of Bishop Blomfield. He chose for his subject "Divisions in the Church." He pointed out that such divisions, however lamentable, were nothing new; they existed in the Primitive Church, in the Church of Rome, and in the unhappy ramifications of English sects. He showed that unity was undervalued, and that there was a special danger for the clergy in not putting into practice what they preached. He pointed out the natural difficulties of unity, in view of the great number of subjects touched by religious belief; that they were increased by the extreme importance of these subjects; and that there was often as much self-indulgence in discord as in any other vicious tendency. At the same time he pointed out that while there were no restrictions for charity, there were

necessary limitations for actual unity; and while enforcing the benefit of unity in public objects, he deprecated any support of sectarian associations. In the next place, he spoke of the natural propensity of the human mind to extremes, not only in religious matters: "It is quite as prevalent," he says, "in matters of taste, in literature, politics, and philosophy." He went on to warn preachers and public men against the common habit of negligence with regard to being misunderstood. It is perfectly true that many men are too indolent, or too proud, or too timid, to explain; and consequently party spirit grows. He pointed out, too, the dangers of oratory, —magniloquent indistinctness, and the common habit of using important words in a double sense. He deprecated, in sentences of great wisdom, all asperity of language in controversy. He spoke strongly against the practice of anonymous writing, and ended with a touching and eloquent appeal, as true now as it was thirty-four years ago, for self-sacrifice in the cause of unity.

The Charge of 1848 reflected the natural alarm of a shrewd and cautious mind at the novelty of the assembling of Convocation after 170 years of silence, in times of dispute, turmoil, and innovation; especially as the demand came from the innovating party. On this he further enlarged in the Charge of 1852. In the second place he recorded an energetic protest against the misrepresentation lately made with regard to the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the bishopric of Hereford, to the effect that the election of Bishops should be popular. Popular election was an innovation which crept into the Church through divisions caused by the Arians and the Donatists. He related the frightful enormities committed at these elections, expressed the lasting gratitude of the Church to Councils and Emperors for her rescue from republicanism, investigated the system of lay patronage, and recommended a prudent acquiescence in a harmless anomaly, which on the whole acted well. The remainder of the Charge was taken up with the progress of National Education. Besides topics of which the immediate interest has now passed away, he pointed out what is still a difficulty in the administration of education grants, the inequality with which these grants fall on rich and poor localities. This was the year of revolutions, and the Charge ends with a passage of the most earnest eloquence on the fact that religion, besides its other claims, is the only political security.

The Charge of 1849 continued the discussion of the same subject. The Archdeacon pleaded for that which we should now be so glad to find—greater width and liberty in the management of schools in different localities and in different

circumstances. He objected to the arbitrary manner in which the Education minutes were passed through the Houses of Parliament, inconsistent with the proceedings of the Committee of Council; and he strongly protested, in consideration of the early age at which children left school, against the multiplication of subjects of instruction of which they could only obtain a smattering. He insisted that knowledge of Christianity and the English language are the true objects of elementary education. He pointed out that the certain result of impracticable standards of knowledge would be to gradually place education more and more upon the rates and taxes, and to oust voluntary effort from the field. He objected very strongly, in language which we should now be prepared to echo, against the unwholesome excitement produced by frequent inspections, and he warned the clergy, in language which in many cases has not been sufficiently regarded, that the best security against both cramming and parade would be their own frequent presence in their schools. The Charge had a most interesting appendix of nearly fifty pages of letters from clergymen, showing the actual results of the influence of the Church and Church schools, in the support of law and order, during the turbulent years immediately preceding.

The Charge of 1851 has a peculiar interest, as it gives the impressions of a shrewd and unbiassed mind (which had already exerted its strong Church loyalty as far back as the year 1833, in a volume of "Dissertations indicating the Church of England in respect of some Essential Points of Polity and Doctrine) on the general advance of the mediæval and Romanizing body within the Church of England, and in particular on the tempest of excitement which followed the Gorham judgment, which swept from the English communion Manning, Archdeacon of Chichester; Wilberforce, Archdeacon of the East Riding; Henry Wilberforce, and others. The Charge gives a brilliant and most artistic picture of the history of the "Tracts for the Times." It speaks in frank and weighty language of the evil of all party associations. He contrasts with great skill the protests of the earlier "Tracts for the Times" with their latest developments, and quotes with much effect the language of Mr. Dodsworth to Dr. Pusey, showing how far his teaching had brought him on the road to secession. In discussing the Gorham question of Baptismal Regeneration, the Charge points out that neither the Church of Rome nor the Church of England had ever strictly defined the amount of grace received in baptism; that the modern question of the nature of regeneration was not in any way before the Fathers, but simply an inquiry whether second baptism were possible. The question was really one of the absolute decrees of

predestination, about which the Church of Rome felt just as much perplexity as the Church of England. Regeneration, as a change of condition, did not imply that change of nature which belongs to conversion, and which is foreseen by predestination. The Church of England is sacramental, but sacramental in no exclusive sense. In concluding with the discussion of the subject of the recent Papal aggression, the Charge argued that the right weapons against Rome were the study of Scripture and zealous enthusiasm for Church extension amongst the poor, avoidance of sudden excitements and hasty pledges, and the cultivation, by the representative officers of the National Church, of the great duty of circumspection.

In the Charge of 1852 the Archdeacon discussed with great completeness the dangers of the revival of synodal action. He began by enumerating the advantages which the Church already enjoyed, and which synodal action could not touch. These were the authorized canon of Holy Scripture; the Authorized Version; the recognition of the inspiration of the Word of God by the Primitive Church faithfully embodied in the three Creeds, the Articles, the Liturgy and Catechism; the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Administration of the Sacraments, so complete in itself that the revision of it would be perilous in the extreme, and must be postponed, as Dr. South said, till a reviser should be found equal in ability, judgment, piety and learning to the original compilers; large endowments, and the spirit of general progress for Church extension and Church education. Synodal elections, he thought, would but increase party spirit; the history of synodal debates was the reverse of encouraging; the multiplication of doctrinal decrees was much to be deprecated; there were as many disputes inside Rome as out; as a specimen of clerical creed-making the Westminster Confession was deplorably narrow. Large assemblies were bad courts of appeal. In the present state of difficulty it was most undesirable that Convocation should attempt to legislate; the laity desired no revival in its powers; its mechanism was extremely antique; all kinds of hitches might be foreseen, and their recent experience of the party who were most desirous of the revival of Convocation was by no means of happy augury for its future.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

(To be continued.)

