as Christ discoursed it to Nicodemus in the New Testament—but also (2) because the literal sense of the like words in this very article introduced the heresy of the Capernaites; and (3) because the subject and predicate in the words of institution are diverse and disparate, and cannot possibly be spoken of each other properly. (4) The words in the natural and proper sense seem to command an unnatural thing, the eating of flesh. (5) They rush upon infinite impossibilities, they contradict sense and reason, the principles and discourses of all mankind, and of all philosophy. (6) Our blessed Saviour tells us that 'the flesh profiteth nothing'; and (as themselves pretend) even in this mystery, that 'His words are spirit and life.' (7) The literal sense cannot be explicated by themselves, nor by any body for them. (8) It is against the analogy of other Scriptures. (9) It is to no purpose. (10) Upon the literal sense of the words, the Church could not confute the Marcionites, Eutychians, Nestorians, the Aquarii. (11) It is against antiquity. (12) The whole form of words in every of the members is confessed to be figurative by the opposite party. (13) It is not pretended to be verifiable without an infinite company of miracles. . . . (14) It seems to contradict an article of faith, viz., of Christ's sitting in heaven in a determinate place, and being contained there till His second coming" ("Real Presence," sect. vi., § 11; "Works," vol. vi., p. 67; edit. Eden).

N. Dimock.

Art. IV.—CHURCH REFORM.[1]

It may be safely predicted that, just as the mention of the sixteenth century is always associated with the word "Reformation," so the nineteenth century will ever, at any rate in this country, be connected with the idea of "Reform." It has witnessed Reform Bills without number, reforms in almost all our civil and secular institutions, and no small amount of reform in our ecclesiastical system. The improvements effected in the Church (by which expression I mean throughout this paper "the Church of England") about the commencement of the present reign, by the establishment of the Ecclesiastical Commission, the commutation of the tithes, and the passing of the first Pluralities Act and the Church Discipline Act, amounted to little short of a revolution. After that came a lull; but as the decades rolled by, important

[1] A paper read before the South-Eastern Clerical and Lay Church Alliance, on June 18, 1895, by P. V. Smith, LL.D., Chancellor of the Diocese of Manchester.

changes were brought about. The terms of clerical subscription were relaxed, the Table of Lessons was altered, the use of shortened services was permitted, and the number of bishops was increased. At length, about ten years ago, a fresh demand arose for still more sweeping Church reforms. The amount actually effected up to the present time, as the result of this demand, has not been such as to satisfy the more ardent spirits amongst us; but the movement, so far from being exhausted, appears to grow in intensity from day to day.

In discussing the lines upon which we should proceed in the future, it is essential in the first place to determine the object which we desire to attain. There are two classes of would-be Church reformers, whose aims and ends are diametrically opposite. The one class regard as disastrous the presence within the Church of what they consider to be erroneous teaching and practices, and desire to introduce such reforms as would render the continuance of them impossible. The others, on the contrary, are anxious to expand rather than to contract the limits of the Church. Between these opposite aspirations no agreement can be negotiated. We must, therefore, at the outset of our subject, make up our minds as to which of them is correct. And this will depend on the view which we take of the true *rôle* and *status* of the Church. Ought she to be a mere sect, struggling to hold her own among other Christian bodies, and inviting our allegiance on the ground of her practical superiority to them; but making no claim to be *the* national visible representative of the Holy Catholic Church in this country, and maintaining no protest against the division of Christians inhabiting the same locality into various competing denominations? Or ought she to assert her position as the one National Church of the land, to which, if God's will were done in earth as it is in heaven, all English Christians would belong?—although, partly from her own fault, and partly from the fault of others, this is, unhappily, far from being the case at present, and, under existing circumstances, we lay no personal blame on those who are detached from her communion. To me, at any rate, the mere statement of the alternative supplies the answer. The sentence of condemnation which St. Paul passed upon the divisions of the early Christians, who were yet all the time in communion with each other, appears to me to apply with tenfold force to the divisions of the present day, which actually debar us from intercommunion, and coop us up in separate ecclesiastical organizations. The use of the prayer for unity on Whit-Sunday in this and, I believe, in other dioceses, and in not a few Nonconformist places of worship, is one among many signs that we are becoming alive to this. And, surely, the

remedy lies not in narrowing, but in widening the Church. It was well said by some old sage, "Unity of opinion is the bond of ignorance, unity of profession is the bond of hypocrisy, unity of the Spirit is the bond of peace." And if we join with the Apostle in praying for grace upon all those who love in sincerity Jesus Christ, the Lord Jehovah, we shall do all we can, consistently with the maintenance of lawful liberty of thought and action for ourselves as well as for them, to unite them to us outwardly as well as inwardly. The reforms which I am about to advocate, though put forward primarily in the interests of the Church herself and of her present members, would, if carried out, tend to smooth the way for this much-to-be-desired consummation.

I propose to submit suggestions as to reform on four heads, namely, Cure of Souls, Finance, Public Worship, and Government. Of these the two former appear to me to be the more pressing, and, at the same time, to be the more likely to be speedily advanced. The first subject — Cure of Souls — embraces the whole legal relationship of an incumbent to his parishioners; that is to say, (*a*) his appointment to the parish, (*b*) his rights during his incumbency, and (*c*) his removability.

(*a*) It is universally admitted that the law and practice as to the appointment of incumbents to parishes, or, as it is generally called, Church patronage, stand in need of reform, though considerable difference of opinion exists as to the precise lines on which that reform should be carried out. Some of us would abolish private patronage altogether; others, without going so far as that, would totally prohibit the sale of patronage; and while the majority who have considered the question are in favour of the less drastic proposals of the Archbishop's Bill on the subject, there is yet a fourth section who consider even these proposals too sweeping, and would limit the reform to the creation of some safeguards against patronage falling into unworthy hands. I frankly confess myself to be on the side of the majority in this matter. Their view appears to me to be not only the only one which is practically feasible at the present moment, but also to be on the whole as defensible in theory as any other. No system of patronage will be absolutely free from objection, and private patronage has advantages which would be lost by its complete suppression. So long, however, as it is retained, there must be retained with it the legal right to transfer the patronage; otherwise it would inevitably in some instances ultimately fall by descent into the hands of a pauper, a criminal, or a resident at the Antipodes, who would have no power of dispossessing himself of it. And to restrict the right of transfer to voluntary transactions while transfer by sale was prohibited would in

some cases invite evasions of the law by secret bargains, and in others would enormously increase the difficulty of obtaining a surrender of the patronage from an undesirable owner of it.[1] The right course seems, therefore, to be to retain the sale of patronage, but to get rid of the existing scandals and abuses attending it. These are, roughly speaking, of two kinds: First, the putting up of an advowson, apart from any property in the parish, for sale by public auction to the highest bidder; and, secondly, the conversion of the sale of patronage into what is practically a sale of the cure of souls itself, either by the sale of the next presentation apart from the rest of the advowson, or by the sale of the advowson immediately before an inevitable or prearranged vacancy, and by the power which the purchaser possesses of presenting himself or the person in whose interest the purchase was made. Both of these abuses are struck at by the Archbishop's Bill, which also proposes to give to the parishioners an opportunity and a recognised legal status to make objections to an intended appointment of an incumbent, and enlarges the grounds on which a bishop may decline to ratify the appointment by institution. Fault has been found with this last-mentioned proposal, on the ground that it will place the destinies and reputation of the clergy too much in the hands of the bishops and of the archbishops, to whom an appeal will be allowed; and the Church Patronage and Avoidance of Benefices Bill which has been introduced into the Commons, and contained an almost identical provision, has been amended in this respect by the Standing Committee on Law, to which it was referred after its second reading. As it now stands, if any parishioner objects to the appointment, the objection is to be considered by the bishop and two assessors, one of them being the chancellor of the diocese, or some barrister or solicitor as his deputy, and the other being the archdeacon or rural dean, or, failing them, some clergyman appointed instead. Institution will then be

[1] The only conditions on which the total abolition of traffic in private patronage could be entertained would be: First, Due regard to the vested interests of existing patrons, either by awarding them a pecuniary compensation for the loss of their proprietary rights, or else by fixing such an interval (say twenty-five years) between the passing of the measure and the date of its taking effect as would be a sufficient substitute for pecuniary compensation; and, secondly, the legal conversion of private Church patronage into a pure trust, with all the legal incidents of a trust, including a power to persons interested in its due execution, to obtain from the High Court or some other competent authority the appointment of a new trustee of the patronage, in case of the patron going to reside abroad, or becoming bankrupt or otherwise unfit to act in the trust, and failing himself to appoint a fit patron in his place. If these two conditions could be satisfactorily secured, the sale and purchase of advowsons might be absolutely prohibited.

refused only if the bishop and one of the assessors consider that some ground for so doing, which is mentioned in the Bill, is proved to exist. For my own part, I think that a middle course between the two Bills would be the best. I would not require the assessors to be summoned to hear every objection made by a parishioner. I would give the bishop power to reject on his own authority any which he thought frivolous or untenable, and only require him to try the matter with the assessors in cases where he considered that there was a *primâ facie* case shown for refusing institution.

(*b*) Passing on to the parson's rights during his incumbency, I mean by these his control over the parish church and its services, and his power of prohibiting the ministrations of any other clergyman in the parish, with the solitary exception of the bishop of the diocese. As to the first of these rights, I do not suggest any reform. The legal relations in this respect of the incumbent to the ordinary, the churchwardens and the vestry, are, I submit, satisfactory. But I venture to urge a modification of the second. It has already been encroached upon by the Church Building and New Parishes Acts; under some of the provisions of which a new church with independent patronage can, under certain circumstances, be built, and a new and independent parish be formed, within the limits of an existing parish, without the consent and against the will of the incumbent. In closely-populated towns, where the area of each parish is small, parishioners who are out of sympathy with their own incumbent on account of doctrine or ritual, or for any other cause, can, and frequently do, attach themselves to another congregation, and, in case of sickness, inter-parochial comity allows of their being visited by the pastor of their choice. But in more rural districts this is not possible, and in these districts it not unfrequently happens that large numbers desert the Church and betake themselves to Nonconformist ministrations, in consequence, in some instances, of the complete neglect of the parson to provide opportunities of public worship in a remote part of the parish, and, in other instances, of his presenting them with a ritual which is distasteful or objectionable to them. I maintain that in both these cases the parishioners ought to have the power, with the sanction of the bishop, assisted, if you will, by a consultative council, to provide themselves with a Church of England place of worship and a clergyman to minister in it independently of the incumbent. This is no novel idea. A Bill to give effect to it was actually introduced into Parliament in four successive years from 1872 to 1875. In 1873 it was carried through the House of Commons before Easter, and its second reading in the Upper House was supported by the advocacy of Archbishop

Tait and by the votes of Archbishop Thomson and ten other prelates. No bishop voted against it; but it was thrown out through the exertions of Lord Shaftesbury and Lord Dynevor. But for the mistaken though well-intentioned opposition of those two noblemen, this important item of Church reform would have become an accomplished fact twenty years ago.

(*c*) Coming now to the incumbent's removability, we are all aware that he has at present a freehold in his benefice, from which he cannot be removed against his will, except for gross breach of ecclesiastical law or grave moral delinquency. If a commission of inquiry finds him guilty of flagrantly neglecting his duty, he can be required to appoint and pay one or more curates, and if he fails to do this, the bishop can make the appointment and sequester the revenues of the benefice to provide the necessary amount of salary. But, however mischievous may be the continuance of the incumbent in the living, and his residence in the parish, no power exists to put a stop to either. To judge from the utterances of some of the clergy, they seem to regard this state of things as their natural right. The laity, on the other hand, accept it as a historical fact, and realize its useful side in conferring upon the clergy an independence, which, if rightly used, is of great value. But they recognise also that it leads, in some few cases, to grievous mischief; and there is a strong feeling that these cases call for a modification of the law. Witness the Church Patronage and Avoidance of Benefices Bill, already referred to, which was brought in and supported by what is called the Church party in the House of Commons, and has passed the two ordeals of a second reading and a discussion in the Standing Committee on Law in that House. I have already alluded to the clauses of that Bill on the subject of presentation to livings. With respect to avoidance, it proposes in the first place that sequestration of a benefice on bankruptcy, or for debt, shall in certain cases, unless the bishop directs to the contrary, render the living void; and in the second place it makes the compulsory retirement of an incumbent possible, in case of three years' mental or bodily incapacity. But the commissioners who are to deal with such a case may certify that the retirement is inexpedient, if provision has been made for the adequate performance of pastoral duties in the parish; and the pension to the retired incumbent is to be one-third of the income of the benefice, or if that fraction is under £100, then £100 or so much of that sum as the income of the benefice will produce. Cases not within either of these two categories are treated in a different manner. The Bill recognises that remissness or wanton failure in the discharge of the duties of the incumbency, however culpable,

and however injurious in its consequences, ought not to be visited with the same condign punishment of deprivation, as is incurred by the commission of a serious offence. It proposes, therefore, to deal with culpable incompetence by extending and making more stringent the provisions of the Pluralities Acts in reference to neglect of duty. If a commission of inquiry is appointed under those Acts, and the commissioners report that "the incumbent is unable through his own fault, or unwilling, competently to discharge the cure of souls" in the parish, the bishop is to have power to suspend him by inhibition from his office for so long as the bishop thinks fit. The following incidents are liable to attach upon an inhibition: (1) the bishop may appoint a curate or curates to perform the duty and direct payment of their salary out of the income of the benefice; with this proviso that the incumbent is to be left, for his own use, not less than £100 a year, or the whole income, if under that sum, or one-third of the income, if one-third exceeds £100; and (2) the bishop may, if he considers it requisite in the interests of the parishioners, order the incumbent to vacate the parsonage house; which in that case may be let during the inhibition, or assigned as the residence of the curate or curates. An appeal, however, is to lie to the archbishop against the inhibition itself and any of its incidents.

I have dwelt at some length on the first branch of our subject, on account of the two Bills actually before Parliament. It must be admitted that the second of them has not received the same amount of general attention, or been so fully discussed, as the first; and it is easy to raise the cry that its provisions will operate harshly and unjustly upon deserving clergy. But the experience of all former legislation warrants no such anticipation. Both Bills are honest attempts to remedy existing evils; but it is safe to predict that, if they become law, they will be administered with too much, rather than with too little leniency.

II. My second heading is Finance. If in my former remarks I may appear to have shown too little sympathy with our parochial clergy, I hope that I shall atone for it by what I am about to say. From the time of St. Paul downwards, the remuneration of the clergy has always been a serious problem in the Christian Church. In this country, thanks to the universal endowment of the Church by our forefathers, the problem has not presented itself with the same urgency as it might have done; but even here it has long been more or less pressing. It was the occasion of the founding of the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy as long ago as 1655; and the numerous other clerical charities which have been instituted

attest the extent to which it has been recognised as existing. But it has recently assumed an acute form, partly in consequence of the agricultural depression (which has reduced the rents of glebe lands, and in some cases rendered them unlettable, and in connection with which the value of every nominal £100 of the tithe rent-charge has fallen from £112 15s., at which it stood in 1875, to £73 13s.), partly in consequence of the large number of new and unendowed or poorly endowed benefices which it has been necessary to create in districts suddenly become populous, and partly in consequence of the clergy as a body not having the same amount of private means as heretofore. As matters stood in 1893 (and they are probably worse now), out of a total of 14,018 benefices, only 4,080, or less than one-third, enjoyed an income of £300 and upwards; while of the remaining two-thirds 1,379 had an income of less than £100, and 4,173 an income of between £100 and £200. Heartrending instances of clerical distress are from time to time made known, and many more exist which are never disclosed. Surely some reform is wanted here; some scheme which, without superseding or interfering with the existing clerical charities and sustentation funds, shall supplement their efforts and meet the cases with which they do not deal. So far, there is general agreement; but unfortunately the widest divergence of opinion prevails as to the direction which the reform should take, and the lines upon which the scheme should be formed. In 1893 the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation resolved that it was desirable to establish a general fund from which there should be made grants from year to year, or for a longer period, in augmentation of the incomes of poor benefices, and also (when deemed expedient) grants for the permanent augmentation of such benefices by calling forth grants from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners or Queen Anne's Bounty, or from other sources. The Upper House preferred simply a scheme for the permanent augmentation up to £200 a year of the 4,173 benefices between £100 and £200, which, of itself, would require an annual income of £210,000, or a capital sum of £7,000,000; and they suggested that half of this should be raised as a general fund, and the other half as diocesan funds. The House of Laymen, a few months later, declared in favour of the permanent augmentation of poor benefices as the best remedy for the impoverishment of the clergy, and recommended that a diocesan association for the purpose should be formed in every diocese in which there was not one already existing.

On the other hand, the Convocation of the Northern Province decided in favour of an organization confined to the province, and proposed diocesan boards to administer the funds; and the House of Laymen of that province, unlike

their brethren in the south, expressed a preference for sustentation by means of annual grants rather than the permanent augmentation of livings. As the natural consequence of this conflict of opinion, nothing has as yet been done. But the need for action is as great as ever, if not greater; and there are signs that the question will not be allowed to rest. At their session last April, the London Diocesan Conference passed unanimously the following resolutions:

"(1) That it is the duty of every adult lay member of the Church to contribute individually towards the support of the clergy; and that, with a view to providing all the clergy with an adequate income, a general clergy sustentation scheme should be framed and a general fund established to which Churchpeople of all classes and all degrees of income should be expected to contribute. (2) That reforms in Church patronage and in the tenure of livings ought to accompany the carrying out of the scheme, and that the vested rights of the clergy, under the present system of Church patronage and of the tenure of livings, ought not to confer any vested right of continuous participation in the benefits of the scheme. (3) That copies of these resolutions be sent to the Houses of Convocation and the Houses of Laymen of Canterbury and York, with a request that they will take them into speedy consideration and draw up a scheme of sustentation for the Church."

It was evident from the tone of the discussion that the Conference were quite prepared to recognise that there should be full liberty under the scheme to appropriate contributions to the northern or southern province, or to a particular diocese or parish or other area; and the concession of this liberty would enable the existing diocesan funds, as well as the provincial organization resolved on by the York Convocation, to be affiliated to the scheme or dovetailed into it. It would also admit of special funds being hereafter started to benefit particular areas. I believe that such a scheme represents the reform which we want. It would be based on the foundation of the duty of the laity, and not of charity; it would be thoroughly comprehensive and elastic, and it could be so worked as to be a help in keeping the clergy up to the mark in the performance of their duty, since the administrators of the fund might withhold sustentation from a parson who flagrantly failed in that respect.

III. I have mentioned Public Worship as a third point of reform. It is here that the views of the two schools of Church reformers stand out in sharpest contrast. The one would revise the Prayer-Book, eliminating from it all that suggests sacerdotal or sacramentarian doctrine; while the

other, instead of further limiting the formularies to be used in divine service, would give additional license in reference to them. After my opening remarks, it is needless to say that the reform which I advocate is of the latter kind. In an irregular way much has already been done towards effecting it. Nominally our public services are regulated by the Act of Uniformity of 1662, as modified by the Amending Act of 1872, which, under certain restrictions, permits shortened services and the dividing of services. But in practice the law is everywhere ignored and set at defiance. It has been tacitly assumed that the promise which every clergyman makes at his ordination, that in public prayer and administration of the sacraments he will use the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority, has no application to services in unconsecrated buildings such as mission-rooms. In these the parson indulges in exactly what form or absence of form he pleases. He does the same in church at any extra service beyond the regular Matins and Evensong and Communion service, and even with these wholly unauthorized liberties are taken. Not only are the State Prayers often omitted on Sunday without any legal warrant, but I have even heard the Litany begun immediately after the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, Sentences, and Collects being skipped over. It has become, as we know, an almost universal practice to omit the Exhortation in the Communion Service, and that service is frequently commenced in the early morning at the Offertory Sentences, or, if any part of the ante-Communion Service is used, at any rate the Commandments are passed over. The introduction of hymns at the beginning and end of the service and before the sermon is, of course, a practice of much longer standing. The net result of all these departures from the strict letter of the law, and of the sanction to a certain latitude in ritual which has been given by the decisions in the ecclesiastical cases during the last five-and-twenty years, and notably by that in the Bishop of Lincoln's case, is that while the Prayer-Book remains the authoritative standard of the Church's forms and ceremonies, individual incumbents may and do, without rebuke or hindrance, indulge in a large license of variation from it. The religious spirit of the times undoubtedly requires this elasticity. It is new wine which will not be confined in the old bottle of uniformity. The fact that reform in this direction is being to such an extent informally carried out renders an alteration in the law on the subject less pressing than it otherwise would be. At the same time, the present state of things is not altogether satisfactory. It allows the parson, who has no qualms of conscience about breaking the unwritten law of the

Church, to consult expediency to an extent from which his more scrupulous brother shrinks. It encourages general lawlessness all round, with the result that some of the clergy outstep all bounds of moderation, while those who inveigh against them for so doing have, if not beams, at any rate very big motes, in their own eyes. The reform which I regard as wanted is, roughly speaking, the legalization of the present state of unauthorized license, with some additional facilities for framing new prayers on various subjects, as, for instance, foreign missions. It would not be complete if it did not dispel all doubt as to the lawfulness of Evening Communion, and give explicit permission for the distribution of the elements without the repetition of the formulas of administration to each individual.

IV. The suggestion of altering the law of the Church on the subject of public worship naturally brings us to my fourth branch of reform—Church Government, including the process of legislation; since none of us would care to see a Bill for further amending the Act of Uniformity run the gauntlet of the House of Commons as at present constituted. A time when the very foundations of the fabrics of Church and State are threatened is not the most opportune for proposing structural alterations in that fabric. Yet it is well to recognise that in defending the principle of the Establishment we are not committed to the defence of all its existing incidents. The Church would remain the National Church, and the union of Church and State would be preserved, if, instead of the Crown appointing the bishops and deans, the initiation of their appointment were left to the Church, with the requirement, however, that it must be sanctioned by the Crown; and if, instead of ecclesiastical laws being made by Parliament, the Church were permitted to enact them for herself, subject to the right of Parliament to veto any measure which appeared to it to be inconsistent with the interests of the nation. I am not prepared with any alternative to the present mode of appointing our Church dignitaries. The problem is not an easy one, as is proved by the experience of our colonies, where the difficulties of an election are not unfrequently evaded by committing the choice of a new bishop to certain prelates in the mother country. With respect to the future legislative and governing bodies of the Church, it is possible to speak with more confidence. The framework for these already exists in the voluntary Parish Councils, Ruridecanal Conferences, and Diocesan Conferences, which have been established during the last quarter of a century; and last, but not least, in the two Houses of Laymen which have been attached to the Northern and Southern Convocations.

The only assemblies of the Church which at present possess a legal and constitutional status lie at the opposite ends of the chain. They are the Convocations on the one hand and the vestries on the other. Both stand in need of reform; the Convocations, to increase the proportion of the non-official members, and render them more truly representative of the whole body of the clergy, and the vestries, to free the system from the accretions of plural voting according to rateable values, and of the select vestry, where it exists—accretions imported in reference to the secular business, which was formerly entrusted to the vestries, but which has now been taken out of their hands by a series of statutes culminating in the Parish Councils Act. The reform of the Convocations presents a *crux*, into the solution of which there is not time to enter now. Suffice it to say that, in spite of the unconstitutional clause on the subject in the Welsh Disestablishment Bill, Parliament has no more right to meddle with the composition of the Convocations than the Convocations have to interfere with that of Parliament. The Convocations must reform themselves; though I admit that they cannot do so without the sanction of Parliament, in some form or other. The vestry question stands upon a completely different footing. It is true that, like the Convocations, the old common law vestries had their origin independently of Parliament. But Parliament has repeatedly legislated respecting them, and it actually created the vestries of our new ecclesiastical parishes. Now that the functions of the old vestries are confined to ecclesiastical matters, the question arises whether their composition should remain as at present, or whether membership of them should be restricted to professed adherents of the Church. The former alternative is more consistent with the claim of the Church to be a national institution; and it has been acquiesced in, without remonstrance, for half a century, as the constitution of the vestries of new ecclesiastical parishes, whose functions have never extended beyond the affairs of the Church. But a strong feeling exists in the opposite direction, and the problem was felt to be one of such difficulty that the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation resolved the other day that any legislation at the present time on the subject of the ecclesiastical vestries would be inexpedient. It will require, however, to be faced sooner or later, together with the question of the qualifications and mode of appointment of churchwardens as purely ecclesiastical officers. And when this has been done, the next step will be to build up, on a legal basis, a series of superior Church assemblies analogous to those now existing for civil purposes. With the vestry, as the counterpart of the parish

meeting, to begin with, a Church Council, consisting of churchwardens and sidesmen, might be elected, to correspond with the Parish Council. The Ruridecanal Conference, when legally constituted, would correspond to the District Council and the Diocesan Conference to the County Council. At the head of all, and analogous, as it has always been, to Parliament, would stand the Convocation of each province, but reinforced, as it had not previously been, by a formally constituted House of Laymen. Whether the two Convocations should for all or any purposes be amalgamated into one National Synod is a question too remote for present discussion; but it is obvious that, if no such step were taken, any new ecclesiastical legislation, which the Church desired to initiate for herself, would have to run the gauntlet of six separate assemblies; namely, the Upper and Lower House of Convocation and House of Laymen of each province. The advantage of this procedure, however, in the way of preventing hasty changes, might possibly outweigh its drawbacks.

The survey of my four items of Church Reform is now completed. I would merely observe in conclusion that one of them—Finance—can be carried out by the Church herself without recourse to any extraneous aid. The others, no doubt, would require the co-operation of Parliament; but it is quite certain that if all Churchpeople were united and persistent in demanding them, this co-operation would not be long withheld.

P. V. SMITH.

ART. V.—PERSONALITY.[1]

"The abysmal depths of Personality."—TENNYSON.

"IF I am not mistaken," said Professor Sanday at the late Church Congress, "Mr. Illingworth's lectures will be found to mark the beginning of a new phase in the religious thought of our time—a phase in which philosophy will once more take its proper place in supplying a broad foundation for other branches of theological study, and at the same time quickening them with new life." The high hopes raised by such words as these will surely not be disappointed when we approach the volume of lectures itself. Since the year 1780 volume after volume of Bampton lectures has appeared in annual succession, broken only in the years 1834 and 1835, when no appointment was made on the Bampton foundation.

[1] "Personality, Human and Divine" (being the Bampton Lectures for 1894). By J. R. Illingworth, M.A. London: Macmillan.