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THE devotion of the Tractarians and their heirs to episcopal church order is notorious. It is true that this devotion has frequently been misinterpreted and its historical importance exaggerated. Many an annoyed bishop, for example, has complained of what he regarded as uncanonical disobedience on the part of those very churchmen whose principles he had most confidently expected to issue in complete submission to the episcopal will. More than one enthusiast for Church union has sought to discredit the hampering notion of apostolic succession as "unanglican" by labelling it "Tractarian," under the wishful impression that this traditional Anglican concept was invented, and not simply revivified, by the Oxford Movement. Too many Anglo-Catholic pamphleteers have fostered the idea that bishops with a due sense of their office and its responsibilities were totally absent from the Churches of England and Ireland for a century and more before 1833. And yet, when all such caricatures have been set aside, it remains undeniable that the Oxford Movement, both by its forceful proclamation of episcopal authority and by its substantial contribution to a new ideal of the episcopal office, has played a decisive role in the historical development of Anglican churchmanship.

In view of the obvious connexion between Tractarianism and the theory and practice of episcopacy, it seems strange that historians of the Oxford Movement should have paid relatively little attention to instances of the application of Tractarian principles to the shepherding of a diocese and the shaping of its life. No doubt two facts help to explain this omission. For one thing, in the heroic age of Anglo-Catholicism, when priests like Bennett, Lowder and Mackonochie were fighting their crucial battles and building up the great "Ritualistic" parishes, Tractarians were still largely excluded from the English episcopal bench. In the second place, the long-established and populous dioceses of the English Church offer little scope for conspicuous creativity on the part of an individual bishop. Outside England, however, these conditions do not hold to the same extent, and instructive examples of Tractarian bishops at work are available from the early years of the Catholic Revival. It is the work of one of these pioneers that I want to introduce in this article, as a small contribution to the study both of Tractarian and of Canadian history.

John Medley of Fredericton was the first active participant in the Oxford Movement to be entrusted with the pastoral care of a diocese,¹ and from

¹. George Augustus Selwyn, Bishop of New Zealand from 1841 (cf. Chambers's Encycl., 12, 408), and Edward Feild, Bishop of Newfoundland from 1844 (cf. Encycl.
the time of his contribution to the great Tractarian project of the *Library of the Fathers* to the end of his life he was generally known as a capable and forthright spokesman for Tractarian views. Indeed, for many years the cause of the Oxford Movement can hardly have had a more highly placed advocate than Medley, and through him New Brunswick became the setting of an important chapter in the story of the Tractarian episcopate.

John Medley was born in London on December 19, 1804, and was carefully brought up, after the early loss of his father, by his able and devout mother, who from the beginning set out to prepare him for the Christian ministry. After attending several schools and acquiring a knowledge of Latin, Greek and Hebrew (the last begun when he was twelve), he matriculated at Wadham College, Oxford, where he graduated in 1826. From his ordination as deacon in 1828 until 1845 he served in the diocese of Exeter—for the last seven years as vicar of St. Thomas', Exeter, and for the last three as prebendary of Exeter Cathedral. At the end of October, 1844, Archbishop Howley asked him to let his name stand for the new bishopric just being set up in New Brunswick. Appointed by Letters Patent on April 25, 1845, Medley was consecrated at Lambeth on May 4, and enthroned in the old parish church, Fredericton, on June 11. In January, 1879, he was elected to what was then the highest office in his church, that of Metropolitan of Canada. From July, 1881, he was assisted in the work of his own diocese by his chosen coadjutor, Tully Kingdon. Medley died on September 9, 1892, and was buried outside the chancel of his cathedral.

In 1845, the new diocese of Fredericton was enough to intimidate any bishop. For one thing, its people had not been too well cared for. The diocese of Nova Scotia was founded in 1787, just four years after the first Loyalist settlers arrived at Saint John, but its first two bishops were handicapped by age and infirmity, with the result that episcopal ministrations were inevitably somewhat sporadic. When we also bear in mind the great difficulties of church extension in a new country, we shall not be surprised to learn

---

2. Medley contributed largely to the translation of St. John Chrysostom's *Homilies* on 1 Cor. (1838).
5. Medley's writings before his elevation include: *The Episcopal Form of Church Government* (1835); *Elementary Remarks on Church Architecture* (1841); *Sermons* (1845).
that in 1836, when the Diocesan Church Society was established, over two-thirds of the parishes of the New Brunswick archdeaconry lacked a resident priest, and that church buildings were grossly inadequate. To make matters worse, the diocese was “full of dissension and strife.” Most of the Loyalist clergy had been of the definite, if conservative, “High Church” breed which had grown up in Connecticut and the neighbouring colonies during the eighteenth century, but the rising “Evangelical” school had taken possession of Trinity Church, Saint John, the most influential parish in the province, and a struggle for power had begun. While the High Church party was helped by the Tractarian-style teaching given by George Coster after his appointment as Archdeacon of New Brunswick in 1829, the Evangelical faction was able to exploit the widespread fears aroused by the development of pro-Roman tendencies in the Oxford Movement. Under the circumstances the timing of Medley’s arrival, in the critical year of Newman’s secession, could scarcely have been worse. It took him many years to allay the suspicions and win the co-operation of a large body of his priests and people, and throughout his episcopate his work was hampered to some extent by “antagonism to his High Church views.”

Even his sharpest critics, however, could not fail to appreciate the force of character with which Medley met his difficulties. “Although small in person,” we are told, “there was a quiet, unconscious dignity about Bishop Medley, which at all times commanded respect.” At times, indeed, respect must have struggled with exasperation, since the bishop was “not infrequently wanting in tact and discernment,” and was “sometimes brusque to the point of rudeness.” “Mr. R.,” he replied to a layman who asked his opinion of a newly erected church, “when you build a church, build a church, and when you build a barn, build a barn.” Obviously he was not a gifted diplomat. But his sincerity of conviction, singleness of purpose, devotion to duty, f airmindedness and general soundness of judgment were not really open to question, and in the long run they won for his diocesan program the support of all but his most implacable opponents.

From the beginning of his episcopate Medley enthusiastically identified himself with his adopted country and his flock—he went so far as to praise the climate and roads of New Brunswick—and laboured unceasingly to ensure the highest standard of pastoral care for his people. His Primary Visitation Charge (1847) contains a good many examples of the kind of practical advice he was to give his clergy through the next forty-five years. Urging the duty of regular “Public Prayer,” he attacks both slovenliness and affectation in the reading of divine service, and insists on natural reverence.

Remarking that there is no wisdom “in depreciating or in neglecting an ordinance of God,” in reaction against an over-emphasis on preaching, he advises varied and simple preaching, based on biblical models; in this connexion he stresses “Public Catechising, in which the elder portion of the congregation, "many of whom are too ill informed to profit by Sermons," may be instructed through the younger. He speaks sharply of the necessity of real pastoral visiting: “When the conversation goes no further that the weather or the crops, or is confined to observations upon persons, it is difficult to see that it is attended with permanent advantage to either party.” The clergy are forcibly reminded of the basic importance and the essential conditions of their own spiritual growth: “If we are always on the move, what time is left for communing with God? If we are always reading letters, pamphlets, and newspapers, what opportunity remains for quiet thought, patient study, grave meditation, silent prayer?” To pastors he particularly recommends “the study of Casuistical Divinity,” with Taylor and Sanderson as exemplars. Later in the same charge he pleads for the study of church music and architecture and for care in the planning of even the plainest church building, and in an appended note he provides simple directions for church builders. In his treatment of these and many other themes as the years pass, the reader of his charges and sermons cannot help being impressed by the rare combination of consistent adherence to fixed principles with robust common sense in their application, and by the farseeing pastoral vigilance which directed the thoughts and words and actions of half a century.

“The Church of England in the Diocese of Fredericton,” wrote Archdeacon Raymond, “learned to know the spirit of the original Oxford Movement, better than any history could teach it, in one who reflected what was best in it.” But the influence which Medley’s ability and character won for him extended far beyond his own diocese. According to his obituary in the Canadian Churchman, which compared his reputation with that of Bishop Strachan, his name had “been among the household words of Canada for nearly half a century.” In Gladstone’s experienced eyes, “his was the wisest head that wore a mitre.” From the United States, Bishop W. C. Doane of Albany wrote to Medley’s biographer: “I feel that to no man on the continent of America more than to him is due the great advance in all things that tend to the upholding of the Catholic faith and order in America. He was Nestor and Patriarch really among us all...”

II

Quite obviously, the immediate inspiration for Medley’s patient and devoted labours and broad sense of his responsibilities was the Tractarian

15. Ibid., pp. 30–32, 45f. Medley’s hand can still be seen in many New Brunswick Churches.
vision of the Anglican Church. It was not that he sought to exclude those who saw the Church in a different light from Anglican fellowship. "Whether a man be called Low Churchman, High Churchman, or Ritualist," he told his clergy, "there is comprehensiveness enough in our church to embrace him, and there ought to be charity enough to make use of his zeal and piety, though as to the means he makes use of to promote the glory of God and the salvation of souls, our conclusions may widely differ." To the principle thus stated his administrative practice strictly conformed. Nonetheless, he made no secret of his conviction that the standards to which the Oxford Movement was recalling Anglicans ought to win acceptance as normative, as conflicting parties found unity in the system of the Prayer Book. If he criticized the "Romanizing" view of Anglican subscription, advanced by Newman in *Tract XC*, he added, with some asperity: "It seems, however, not to have occurred to many, who have been loudest in reprobation of this suggestion, that there is another thing to be condemned besides a non-natural sense of the Articles, and that is a non-natural sense of the whole Prayer Book, and of all its services." He might say, in language which Tractarianism was already making unfashionable, that the Church of England is "both Protestant and Catholic," but in what commonly passed for Protestantism he saw the chronic disease of Anglicanism. Churchmen must admit, he said, in some remarks on the ambiguities of the English Reformation, "that the loose and unscriptural principles which were then and shortly afterwards imported from abroad, as inconsistent with Scripture as with antiquity, are to this day extensively prevailing; that the true notion of Church unity has never to this day properly penetrated the great body of our Church; that the great question of the bounds and limits of private judgment then opened has never been settled; and that, though the doctrines of the Church itself are sound and Catholic, a totally different theology, as false in principle as it is vicious in taste, pervades and leavens the religion of whole masses of our people." The Tractarian diagnosis of the Church's ills could not be more incisively stated.

As the remedy for these ills, Medley wholeheartedly welcomed the Oxford Movement. "The Church," he told the Provincial Synod of Canada, "has (by God's blessing) achieved a second reformation." With the leaders of this "reformation"—notably with Keble—he kept in close contact. As we have seen, he was not in sympathy with that wing of the party which looked

24. Note Keble's practical interest in "dear Medley" (cf. Coleridge, op. cit., p. 363), and Medley's reference to a paten made for his cathedral from silver spoons given by "three dear little boys at Hursley" (Ketchum, p. 115).
to Rome for its ideal of Catholicism, but to the Tractarianism of the *Via Media* he gave both full allegiance and forceful expression. "Unlike Rome," he would say, "we are never, for the attainment of unity, to sacrifice truth; unlike Geneva, we are never to seek for truth to the neglect of unity; lest, as she has done, we let go both." Medley recognizes that to many the notion of the *Via Media* seems "trimming and indecisive," and he knows how it can be corrupted into a rationalization of smug indifference and inaction. "Our position," he warns, "in the middle way between Rome and Geneva, though as regards truth, a strong intellectual and moral position, has its peculiar perils." To Medley, however, with his clear perception of the weakness as well as the strength of Anglicanism, this position is an invitation, not to self-satisfaction, but to greater effort. He tries constantly to rouse his people to effective action, that the Church may "shew herself an active energising body, united and powerful for good, convinced of the reality of her Divine system and of her Divine commission." He makes a point of commenting frequently on the embarrassing efficiency of Roman Catholics and Protestant Dissenters, on either side of the *Via Media*. "To the zeal of such bodies," he says of the latter group, "too much praise cannot be given. It is the great lesson for us to copy."

His appreciation of hard work helped to make Medley a strong defender of the "Ritualists," who were meeting such violent opposition to their translation of Tractarianism into liturgical and pastoral practice. He recognized that the leaders of the Oxford Movement did not share his interest in church architecture and decoration, and in the furnishing of his new cathedral he was himself content simply to follow the accepted use of the great English churches. He had already shown his sympathy with Ritualism, however, by his close association with the "advanced" Church of the Advent, Boston. Twenty-five years later, he was to create a sensation in the Lambeth Conference of 1878 by pleading the cause of the Ritualists and attacking the repressive Public Worship Regulation Act. Still later, in the face of determined resistance, he was to promote the establishment of a centre of Ritualism in Saint John itself. The pastoral concern underlying this consistent policy was vigorously expressed by Medley:

If those who call themselves Evangelical—a title I should refuse to accord to them in such a way as to exclude others from faithfully preaching the gospel of Christ—if those who are called, or call themselves High Churchmen, and those who suppose themselves to be men of broader sympathies than their brethren,

---

31. Cf. ibid., pp. 221, 334f.
can work together in the same church for the common weal, ... why should the Ritualist be excluded? Why should he have a special scourge invented for his peculiar benefit, called by one of the many ironies of life fatherly correction? I do not undertake to justify any rude and uncharitable expressions used in haste and anger towards those whose age, station and authority in the church command respect, but I make great allowance for the feelings of men, who, thoroughly in earnest themselves, devoted to hard and often ill-paid work, seek to attract and to christianize rude and half-heathen populations, and having succeeded in this arduous task, and made up congregations of most unpromising materials, who are devoutly attached to their pastors, and delight in a service in which they can all join, find themselves prosecuted by people who send hired spies to watch, not to worship, in their churches, and are brought under the lash of a law which scarcely any of the bishops themselves perfectly obey, and notoriously, those bishops who put the law in operation obey it the least. ... This one Body which numbers in its ranks some of the most holy and self-denying of our priests, some of the most learned of our liturgists, some of the most liberal, loyal and spiritual of our laymen, is denounced. The law ... only seems framed to crush them, or to drive them ... into the arms of another Communion to which they most properly refuse to go.33

This was unusual language for an eminent Victorian prelate, but Medley had to bear witness to a movement which was giving such striking embodiment to his own principles.

III

The heart of Medley's Tractarian outlook and policy was, of course, the idea of the Church as a supernatural society, essentially independent of the State, calling men to a transcendent holiness, proclaiming a divine message in its doctrine and ministering divine grace in its sacraments, acting by the authority of Christ himself, visibly mediated to its ministers through the apostolic succession of its bishops. Much of this appears in two passages of a sermon to the Exeter clergy (on Ephes. 4:16). "The argument of the apostle," Medley says, "leads us ... to this conclusion, that the doctrine of Church-union is interwoven with the whole body of revealed truth, and is as much a part of that revelation, as the atonement and resurrection of Christ, the remission of sins, and the life everlasting. ... To teach the truths of the Gospel so as to exclude Church-union, the fellowship of the members in that union, and the 'one baptism for the remission of sins,' is to teach it maimedly and ineffectually, and so far to turn aside from apostolic teaching." And later on: "By a high view of the privileges of our Apostolical commission, and of the tremendous responsibility of our office, by a burning zeal for the salvation of souls, an intense devotion to the Church as Christ's spouse, a willing obedience to them that are set over us in the Lord, and a sacrifice of our private views on the altar of unity; by such means alone we shall be 'fitly framed together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth,' in the Lord's temple."34 The primary concerns of the Oxford Movement could hardly be better stated.

33. Provincial Synod Sermon, p. 12f.
34. The Union of the Members in Christ's Body, pp. 8, 25.
Medley is fully aware of the significance of the Church-and-State problem as the immediate context of the Tractarian reaffirmation of the Church's supernatural authority and the English Church's Catholic heritage. The Tractarians asked, he says, "whether Establishment was the real foundation on which she rested? Had her Prayer-book no link with the past? Were her orders traceable to apostolic times? Had her bishops and clergy any authority independent of what the State could confer?" The Tractarian answers to these questions, he adds, gave great offence, by their unexpected challenge to secularist assumptions. "The notion of any powers wholly spiritual, and independent of the state, appeared so novel and so foreign to men's minds, that men lashed themselves into fury at the thought." Medley is convinced, nonetheless, that this infuriating notion is the true basis of the Church's "everlasting claim" on men's devotion. "Strip the Church of England of what is so well calculated to attract the man of taste, to command the respect of the wealthy, and the love of the poor, divest it of those hallowed and endearing associations which give it a place in the affections of the great majority of intelligent and sober minds, and it will not lose its claim on the community as a Church of Christ, holding fast the apostolic 'doctrine and fellowship, with breaking of bread and prayers,' and adhering to the ancient discipline of bishops, priests, and deacons."

The Tractarian declaration of independence, linked to a frank appraisal of local conditions, had a decisive effect on Medley's diocesan policy. Both in word and in action he expressed his conviction that the very survival of his diocese depended on the repudiation of every "pleasant fiction" of establishment, lingering on from the early days of the colony, and the assertion of the Church's inherent authority and responsibility. "Unfortunately," he observed in 1847, "the ancient notion clings to the mind when the reality is gone, and therefore, instead of helping themselves, many of us are trying to linger on in the dreamy security of an Establishment." "Old parchments," he remarked in 1853, "are very useful when they convey an inheritance, or secure peaceable possession; but where there is nothing but parchment, it is apt to grow a little musty." As time goes on, he speaks more sharply. "To talk of an established Church in this Province at this time," he says in 1868, "is one of the idlest dreams that could enter into the mind of man." His people must learn to live in the real world. "It would be better to be a real honest church, of somewhat smaller dimensions, doing our own work, and paying our own way, than to have the mere shadow of an establishment, and to be clinging to a real pauperism, with the affectation of a respectability that does not belong to us." For this reason, among others, he urges the adoption of synodical government in the diocese. In 1853, commenting on

35 Provincial Synod Sermon, p. 5.
36. The Episcopal Form of Church Government, 2nd. ed. (Saint John, 1845), p. 42f. Cf. Eighth Visitation Charge, p. 15: "Whilst I would not willingly move a stone of the present establishment. I should be sorry to risk the progress of the christian faith on what formed no part of our Lord's original foundation of his Church."
38. Eighth Visitation Charge, p. 9f.
the revival of Canterbury Convocation, he had claimed that "the calling of Church-Assemblies is an inalienable right of the body which our Lord founded, and to which we belong," and in 1856 he had fully canvassed "the somewhat vexed question of a Synod or Convention" which would shape rules of discipline and regulate the Church's temporal affairs. Now, rejecting a futile dependence on the English Establishment and noting American and Canadian precedents, and with enabling legislation behind him, he appeals for the general acceptance of synodical authority: "The question is whether you will have the decision of the whole church represented by her communicants, lay as well as clerical, or whether you will submit to the dictation of a few irresponsible persons, assuming powers which the Church has not given them, and denouncing every one who dares to differ from them." In the end this alliance of Tractarian theology with political realism proved irresistible.

There is no real conflict between this demand for corporate action and responsibility and the insistence on the "Apostolical commission" of the clergy. As Medley sees it, bishops and Church are one body. He is not a man of one idea, offering "a skeleton outline of Apostolic succession, unaccompanied by the proportions of Apostolic doctrine and practice"; if he exalts the unique authority of the bishop, it is in order to affirm the unique significance of the whole Church, of which the bishops are the earthly centre. This conception of the episcopate in the Church is clearly stated in a sermon of 1851 (in which, incidentally, he also explains his not unrelated determination to build a cathedral at the outset of his episcopate). "Wherever there is a Bishop," Medley says, "there is not only a centre of unity, but a rallying point for action. The Bishop, by God's ordinance, stands not alone. He has in himself the power to send, to increase, to multiply. By these few loaves and fishes, these fragments of his saving mercy, the Great Bishop of souls still feeds his scattered flock, and everywhere augments his fold. Where there is a Bishop, there is a Cathedral Church, the mother-Church of the diocese, Jerusalem and her daughters." Bishop and cathedral together are as it were a visible token of the living presence of Christ himself in the midst of his Church.

In Medley's eyes, we must quickly add, lest he be suspected of an obsession with mitres and Gothic arches, the whole visible order and worship and organization of the Church exist for one purpose—to form a holy people. The Oxford Movement's serious call to holiness and its accent on austerity are faithfully echoed in his preaching. "Want of holiness," he insists, is the

39. Third Visitation Charge, p. 15; Fourth Visitation Charge (Fredericton, 1856), p. 16f.
42. Two Discourses Preached in the Church of the Advent, Boston (Boston, 1851), p.11f.
worst danger to which the Church is exposed. "Do we busy ourselves chiefly," he asks, "with the fussy, superficial activities of the religious world, as if committee meetings, and the formation of new societies would atone for the absence of that holy heart without which no man shall see the Lord?" Again and again he recalls his clergy to the real purpose of their ministry. "O how sad a sight it is," he exclaims, "to behold the once fervent and loving Pastor, who consecrated his whole soul to the service of God, who reaped his highest reward from the love of God, and the affection of his flock, become a worldly, careless, time-serving Priest, striving to be popular by base arts and sinful compliances with the infidel or latitudinarian notions around him, ridiculing the directions of his Prayer Book, despising the admonitions of his Bishop, and only desirous for more and more of the things that pertain to this life!" More than once he comments on the "exceeding selfishness, enormous waste and needless luxury" of contemporary society. Pointing to the day of judgment, he asks if it will "be well then to say, I gave my five or ten pounds for an expensive dress, I laid out my fortune to keep up a handsome appearance, I was noticed as being more handsomely attired than my neighbours, when the word of God said so plainly, 'Why take ye thought for raiment?'" Here, as so often when Medley speaks on moral issues, we might well be listening to Pusey or Newman or Keble.

A great episcopate of forty-seven years is not easily summed up, but Medley himself gives us some help. At his Primary Visitation in 1847, he told his clergy plainly what they ought to be about: "Our great business seems to me to be, to teach men, not to study controversy, but to study holiness: to manifest their christianity and their churchmanship, not by hollow-sounding words, but by solid and fruitful actions: and to confute or convince their real or supposed antagonists by a more virtuous and practical kind of religion, and by a humbler walk with God." Thirty years later, before the Provincial Synod of Canada, he put the principle of his churchmanship into one sentence: "Hand down to coming ages your great Catholic heritage whole, undefiled, un mutilated, unimpaired, for it is Jesus the Saviour who has commanded you to keep the bulwarks of His Church for Him." It would be hard to find more succinct expressions either of the spirit which animated Medley's work or of the aims of the great religious movement which did so much to make him what he was.

43. Provincial Synod Sermon, p. 7.
44. Third Visitation Charge, p. 12.
45. Visitation Charge, 1877, p. 6.
46. Sermons, 2nd ed. (London, 1845), p. 84.
47. Primary Visitation Charge, p. 5; Provincial Synod Sermon, p. 6f.