

## VI.—THE EPISCOPAL CHAPEL OF AUCKLAND CASTLE.

By the Rev. J. F. HODGSON, vicar of Witton-le-Wear.

ADDENDA to vol. xviii., pp. 113-240.

### I.

It has been objected to my remarks upon the late bishop Lightfoot's reflections on the words, '*In non morituram memoriam*,' occurring in bishop Cosin's monumental inscription, that they are absolutely intolerant of the modified and softened sense which, in my account of '*The Chapel of Auckland Castle*,' in the last volume, I have endeavoured to attach to them. The phrase, owing to the inherent force of the future participle in '*rus*,' will not, it is alleged, admit of appeal to the loving sympathy of future readers, as I tried to show; but is, on the contrary, distinctly self-assertive, prophetic, and declaratory of the belief that the memory of the writer will not, or is not likely to, die out. And it must unhesitatingly be admitted that the words, '*In non morituram memoriam*,' literally construed, do beyond question mean—in memory, or, for a memorial, not about to, or that shall not, perish. But equally beyond question may we feel assured, I think, that the great prelate who penned them, and whose sepulchre they cover, never contemplated the possibility of their being understood in the boastful and offensive sense imputed to them by bishop Lightfoot. For what is it that they do actually say, and what, therefore, is the interpretation, strictly and rightfully to be attached to them?

Cosin, be it noted, does not assert, as suggested, his belief that the memory of himself and of his doings was so deeply and universally established, that the time would never come when either he or they should be forgotten. Far from it; nay, on the other hand, something so very far from it as to imply the exact contrary. For what were the circumstances of the case? The inscription which, as we learn

from his will, was written by himself, was directed to be cut upon the vast blue marble slab covering the vault which he caused to be constructed for his last resting place during the closing years of his life. It was composed in the near prospect of death, when the brief and transitory nature of all things earthly must have been vividly present to his mind. It was meant to be read and pondered, not only of the few who had seen and known him, but of the many who should come after, when his body had gone to dust and his memory was forgotten. Living, as all his life long he had done, in the midst of the bitterest civil and religious strife, there were doubtless many who said of him, as aforetime of the Psalmist: 'When shall he die and his name perish;' who trusted that, as in the case of the 'destroyed cities,' his 'memorial should perish with him.' How, then, he may have reflected, should it be preserved; and what, when he himself was gone, should abide to bear witness to him? Left to mere human recollection, his memory, so far from being likely to endure, would, in the ordinary course of things, more or less swiftly disappear. Something less transient, therefore, must be utilized to preserve it. But what must that something be; and what form should that memorial take, which, after he himself had 'passed away, should not pass away;' and which, after he had 'perished, should remain?' What, but this very inscription which, penned by himself, and placed above his dust, he had, for that special purpose, caused to be '*written and engraven with an iron pen in the rock for ever?*' He places, as is perfectly clear, his own poor perishing remains which lay below, and his memory 'writ,' as it were, 'in water,' in direct contrast and opposition to that which, enclosing and protecting them, bore his name and record. So far from being inflated with the vain conceit that his fame was fixed in human memory for all time, he knows better, and trusts only to the material means employed by himself for that purpose.

Viewed in this, their natural and true light, these words are seen to display—as from the character and position of their writer, we might expect them to do—a spirit and a meaning altogether different from that arrogant and vain-glorious one endeavoured to be fastened on them; one that is, as I have ventured to suggest, practically the same as 'perpetual,' and which, issuing from the tomb, asks only, as of old, and however indirectly, for the reader's prayers.

## II.

How the erroneous statement that the *two* larger central compartments of the roof of the ante-chapel contained the arms of Cosin, found its way into the note on page 182, I can only explain as follows:—The examination of that part of the roof was, as I remember, made, on one of my visits, at the last moment, when just on the point of leaving the chapel; and a reference to my note book shows that, as usual, I sketched the plan of the whole twelve panels, but only filled in the details of half of them; all the rest, except these two, being symmetrically balanced by corresponding designs. On the southern of the two larger central ones I drew the arms of Cosin, leaving the other—the difference of whose bearings I cannot at the time, I think, have noticed—blank. Afterwards, when writing the note, I must have assumed that the designs of these two panels were identical. That I should have failed to notice the difference in the first instance must be attributed, I think, to the fact that, as no other arms than those of Cosin and the See are to be found in the entire roof, and as the latter were certainly not upon the other one, I imagined, in ‘my haste,’ that both of them were ‘my Lord’s.’ My attention was, for the first time, and only quite lately, drawn to the subject by the bishop, who pointed out that one only of the two coats was that of Cosin; the other consisting, not of a fret, but of a S. George’s cross, charged at the intersection with a ducal, or royal, crown.

The question, then, naturally arises as to the intent and meaning of this device. The simple fact that no private arms whatever are displayed in any part of the chapel at once precludes the idea that it can have any personal or individual significance. As in the eastern bay above the altar, all the symbols—mitres and cherubic heads—point to things spiritual, so here in the ante-chapel, they seem to speak of that ‘warfare’ which must be ‘accomplished’ by all who would reap the ‘rewards of the righteous,’ or enter into that ‘rest which remaineth to the people of God.’ Ribboned wreaths of victory occupy the four corner panels; the four other intermediate ones, which are filled with winged heads of angels, pointing to those sources of spiritual strength from which alone such trophies can be won. In the outer central panels, mitres, with a more special purpose, direct

attention to him whose personal cognizance, in conjunction with the shield (*of faith*) in question appears in the two actually central ones, and declare jointly that to him, as to all else who enter, the way to the crown of life lies, and must be sought, only in and through the cross; that in every case there is one rule,—‘no cross, no crown.’

---

ERRATA, CORRIGENDA, ET ADDENDA, TO VOLUME XVIII.

Page 117, line 6 from top, *for* ‘qua’ *read* ‘quae.’

Page 143, note, *for* ‘MDD, etc.’ *read* ‘MD, etc.’

Page 178, line 17 from top, *for* ‘plate xxv.’ *read* ‘plate xxvi.’

Page 179, top line, *for* ‘plate xxv.’ *read* ‘plate xxvi.’

Page 182, note, *for* ‘two central larger ones’ *read* ‘one of the two central larger ones.’

Page 205, line 5 from bottom, *for* ‘haec’ *read* ‘hae.’

Page 209, line 11 from top, *for* ‘**ansis**’ *read* ‘**an sis**.’

Page 213, line 12 from top, where the tracery of the windows of Exeter college chapel, Oxford, is referred to, that of the seventeenth-century chapel is meant. This has now been destroyed, and replaced by another from the designs of the late sir G. G. Scott.