THE

CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1902.

ART. I.—A CORONATION SERMON: THE UNITY OF THE EMPIRE.

"What portion have we in David?" (1 Kings xii. 16).

DAVID was one of the most remarkable men who ever lived. He was distinguished for heroism as well as piety. He could use the pen with the same skill as the sword, and some of his lovely and helpful Psalms will outlive all his military exploits; whilst he possessed the singular fascination of bowing men as well as women at his feet, and of winning their affection as well as their devotion. He brought great glory to his nation, not by aiming at it, not by pandering to the tastes or passions of his subjects, but by doing right and acting in the fear of God.

A Frenchman was amazed at reading all Wellington's despatches and not finding one word about glory from the beginning to the end of them. Napoleon avowed that he played with French feeling and tendencies. He said: "Luxury and glory have never failed to turn the heads of the French."

One of David's greatest works was the unity and consolidation of his kingdom. Abner assisted him in this most important undertaking. His aim was to "set up the throne of David over Israel and over Judah, from Dan even to Beersheba" (2 Sam. iii. 10); and he brought the people to the point of decision with the memorable exhortation, "Now, then, do it." They did it, and David sat on the throne of a united kingdom. And yet in a few short years this essential element of a nation's success and stability was swept away. The ten tribes asked: "What portion have we in David? Neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse: to your tents, O Israel: now see to thine own house, David." What was the meaning of this question and of this action?

It meant national sin. David closed his career in the midst of national unity and prosperity, and he was succeeded by his son Solomon. All went well for a time. God gave to Solomon wisdom, power, riches, honour. Jerusalem became famous for its magnificent temple and for its splendid palace. Probably no house, probably no throne, probably no kingly ceremony and no external grandeur, eclipsed that of Solomon. But signs of degeneration and decay and of disruption began to manifest themselves. The thunders of heaven were rumbling in the distance. "The Lord was angry with Solomon"; and no wonder, for, in spite of all his wisdom, he gradually surrendered his judgment to his lust, and "he loved many strange women," and they "turned away his heart from God." Playing with edged tools, he wounded his own soul; toying with serpents, they stung him with their poison. Not that he utterly rejected God; not that he altogether approved of the idolatry that his wives introduced into his kingdom: he tolerated it. "His heart was not perfect with the Lord his God, as was the heart of David his father." As the child of many prayers, as one to whom God had been very good in almost countless ways, his action was not merely an outrage upon decency, but it was an evidence of base ingratitude, and it was an insult to that holy and jealous God to whom Solomon owed continuous obedience and loyal devotion. The aggravation of his sin was God's goodness. So we read: "And the Lord was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the Lord God of Israel, *which had appeared unto him twice.*" Lot's wife, though she had felt the pressure of angels' hands on her wrists, yearned after the treasures and pleasures of Sodom, turned, and was lost. Her daughters had learnt something of sin in the wicked cities of the plain, and though miraculously saved, in a little while they were guilty of awful iniquity. An impenetrable gloom overshadows the closing hours of Solomon's life. No description is given of his death-bed. His name is not mentioned in the great roll of spiritual heroes recorded in Heb. xi. It seems as though we should hear through the ages, and kings, with all their privileges and responsibilities, should always hear, those awful words: "The Lord was angry with Solomon."

It meant also national punishment. The King's conduct affected the nation at large. "No man liveth to himself"—this is especially the case with those who occupy high positions in life. They cannot be, if they would, isolated individuals. Solomon was more than once warned of the consequence of his actions, till at last the words were uttered: "Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept

My covenant and My statutes, which I commanded thee, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee and give it to thy servant. Nevertheless, in thy days I will not do it, for David thy father's sake: but I will rend it out of the hand of thy son" (1 Kings xi. 11, 12). The curse of division came in the days of Rehoboam. From that time onwards Israel may truly have been designated a thorn in the side of Judah. Unity is strength; division is weakness. How careful rulers ought to be in their private and public conduct. There can be little doubt that if they seek God's favour and are obedient to His precepts they will be permanently established on their thrones, and will secure the welfare of those they govern. "The Lord God of Israel saith: them that honour Me I will honour, and they that despise Me shall be lightly esteemed."

Turning now to the great Empire with which we are associated, we have no right to complain of a want of unity. The growth of England has been slow. It is a common saying that "Rome was not built in a day." No great or valuable structure is hastily erected. There have been times when the expansion of our Empire has been from various causes, and not unfrequently by the character and conduct of the ruling Sovereign, frustrated and delayed; but in spite of internal division and external opposition it has, sometimes very slowly and sometimes with a measure of rapidity, advanced. The early progress of Christianity was not by leaps and bounds; and when we speak of the Reformation settlement, we must not conclude that such settlement was effected on a particular day, or month, or year, or by one King or one set of rulers. It had its ups and downs, its successes and its checks, its incipient stages and its solid developments, extending over more than a century and over several reigns. The unity of our Empire is the result of various moral, religious, and national causes, associated with a long and strange history, until it stands out to-day as one of the great wonders of the world. Vast as is the dominion of our King, it is wonderfully consolidated and held together in the bands of a mysterious and beautiful unity.

I. *There is the secular unity of the Empire.* One of its first and distinguishing elements *is the English language.* Our American cousins are in the habit of saying that "the English-speaking race is bound to dominate the world." The English language is a part of Continental education. It is taught in many schools in India, in China, in Japan, and in Uganda, a country just awaking to civilization and just creating a literature. In all the dependencies of the Crown, English is rapidly becoming the common language, and its diffusion has much to do with the unity of the Empire.

It is possible to press this matter too far, and we made a mistake in trying to force English upon the people of Ireland at the time of the Reformation. In a remarkable book only recently published, entitled "The Ruin of Education in Ireland," the gifted and racy author, F. Hugh O'Donnell, refers to the subject. He is advocating the culture of Gaelic, and, though a Roman Catholic, he states our national mistake fairly: "This is not a question of English against Irish, or of English at all. It was the question of teaching Christianity so as to be understood by the Irish people of the time. However useful and necessary the knowledge of the English language, that is no excuse for the religious teachers of a nation abandoning the only speech understanded of the people before that people had time to acquire a substitute. *There was a peculiar ingratitude on the part of Catholic ecclesiastics who flouted the speech which had kept Ireland Catholic.* Dean Swift was neither the first nor the last of the Protestant clergymen in Ireland who bore witness that it was the language 'which prevented the Irish from "being tamed."' In truth, the non-English tongue had been an insuperable barrier to the introduction of the English religion. The Irish Kerne could not learn the new creed, which involved knowledge of the strange speech. In our day the descendants of those Irish Kernes were to unlearn the old creed, which had adopted a strange envelope, while the people still clung to the ancient language. Three-fourths of the island were still Gaelic speakers when Maynooth, slothful and parasitical, resolved to know no Gaelic."

Another element of unity is justice. England is pre-eminent for moral government, as is readily admitted by foreign Powers. It is manifested in policy and diplomacy. Never is there a whisper against the integrity and equity of our judges and magistrates. The highest and lowest in our land are certain of the exercise of justice on all appeals to law. This moral aspect of our national life helps to consolidate the whole kingdom. Does anyone for a single instant suppose that the dependencies of the Crown would rally to a common standard, at great inconvenience and great loss, in a time of real emergency, perhaps of danger, if there were the least shadow of doubt as to the strict justice, fairness, and integrity of England's action? In the South African War, Canada, Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand gave ready service in a cause of righteousness. India would gladly have sent her millions to fight under the Union Jack, if only allowed to do so. Even the native African races would heroically have done the same. Justice and equity between man and man can alone inspire such national sentiments as these—can alone

awaken such a spirit of true patriotism. It should be our holy ambition to foster such sentiments, which give their external manifestations in what may truly be termed a common national brotherhood.

II. *There is the religious unity of the Empire.* We must not, we would not, ever forget: "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it; except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain." It is obvious that religious unity is limited; and yet it is a significant circumstance that Hindoo lips offered prayers to heaven and supplications were made in Mahommedan mosques on behalf of England's late Queen. And it is a matter of historical evidence that, however much the native Indian races may differ from Christian dogma, they are united in their desire for the inculcation of moral duty—that duty which has its most correct form in Christian standards. A pure Christianity is destined to uproot existing native religions, to destroy caste, to burst open the cruel doors of the Zenana, and to give women their legitimate rights. As missionary enterprise progresses, religious unity will become a dominant and controlling factor in national life.

In dealing with our subject we must not make too much of our Christian divisions. I boldly say they do not interfere with national patriotism. Nonconformists are not one whit behind us in the exhibition of those graces which have to do with our national dignity and stability. The general principles of Canon Hensley Henson, in his sermons on Unity, we may accept. The charge of the Archdeacon of London, recently delivered, expresses many sentiments that moderate Churchmen have long advocated. The old sentiment that "Unity is not uniformity" is true. No human power can check true unity. All real believers in Jesus Christ are one, are kings and priests to God, and belong to the true Church of the living God. They may call themselves what they please. They are all taught by one Spirit. They are animated by one living faith. They trust, obey, love one Lord. They are traversing one road to one common goal.

They are the persons who add to the order and dignity of States. They are swayed by more than a patriotic sentiment, for they love and deal with those principles which regulate, conduct, and elevate character. They are the friends of order. They are the supporters of all institutions that alleviate suffering, exhibit growing sympathy, and encourage mental and moral activity. They practise those virtues which are the real strength of domestic, social, and national life. Let us individually be of their number. If we combine to uphold what is good and pure in secular, moral, and religious

institutions, we shall exhibit Christian patriotism in its most resplendent form, and we shall have our share in the maintenance of the greatest Empire the world has ever known, and in the security of the most dignified and Christian of all thrones.

JOSEPH M'CORMICK.

ART. II.—"OUR UNHAPPY DIVISIONS"—III.

OUR object has been to show that, whilst our English theology is strong in support of Episcopacy, it is far from endorsing such a view of Episcopal succession as would make it absolutely essential to the being of a Church, and would therefore unchurch the Churches of the Continental Reformation.

For this purpose we have appealed to the names of English divines most commonly supposed to be the most uncompromising in maintaining the highest view of the Episcopal office.

But now let me be allowed to strengthen my position by reference to the authority of the great

BISHOP ANDREWES.

I take the following quotation from a letter to P. Molinæus, dated December, 1618:

"Id agimus, ut palam sit, et in confesso, eam esse apud nos Politiæ formam, quæ quam proxime accedat ad morem institutumque Ecclesiæ priscæ, sive (ut tu concedis) *Apostolis* proximæ, sive (ut semel scripseras, et nos contendimus) ipsius *Apostolicæ*. . . . Nec tamen si nostra *divini juris* sit, inde sequitur, vel quod *sine ea salus non sit*, vel quod stare non possit Ecclesia. Cæcus sit, qui non videat stantes sine ea Ecclesias: Ferreus sit, qui salutem eis neget. Nos not sumus illi ferrei: latum inter ista discrimen ponimus. Potest abesse aliquod quod divini juris sit (in exteriore quidem regimine) ut tamen substet salus: nec tu igitur *addices Tartaro, aut sententiam damnationis feres in gregem tuum:* Non est hoc damnare rem, melius illi aliquid anteponere. Non est hoc damnare vestram Ecclesiam, ad formam aliam quæ toti antiquitati magis placuit (id est) ad nostram revocare; sed, ubi Deus dederit, et res vestræ ferent. De hoc si conveniat inter nos, cætera concordes erimus" ("Opuscula," pp. 191, 192, A.C.L.).

Let me add the following important quotation from Spottiswood: