
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE

CHURCHMAN

JANUARY, 1882.

ART. I.—THE SUNDAY SERVICE—A "CHURCH REFORM" PAPER.

THAT lengthened prayer is not essential to the attainment of an object we learn on no less an authority than that of our Divine Teacher. More, the converse, if not actually commanded, may be reasonably inferred from the words of the Saviour. By the wisest of monarchs we know that brevity in supplication to the Most High was enjoined. Whether the Church of England, through her appointed rulers, is judicious in sanctioning the lengthened services which obtain so generally—how far the warranty of Scripture is accorded for so doing—are thoughts which obtrude themselves on the minds of such lay members of the Establishment as have at heart a fuller development of her capacity for good.

It may be that the laical voice, less weighted by rigid conventionality and usage of centuries, is better fitted to raise a question in which their spiritual well-being is the admitted object concerned. Left undisturbed, unmooted, now, a day, possibly not distant, may arrive, when the National Church must stand on her own strength, disestablished and disendowed; when, so to speak, the clergy will have to take spiritual stock of the requirements of their congregations; and when the unwisdom of a course of procedure deterrent of the very object which it was their avowed aim to accomplish would be patent to the world.

Her chief pastors might *then* consider how far the words of the Jewish king, and of One who was greater than Solomon, were a guide to the higher life in prayer and praise; whether, too, on grounds of human expediency, apart from higher motives, procedure, which has no weightier recommendation than "custom," must give way to a general demand for vitality in the Worship of the Sanctuary.

Objections by laymen to length in the ordinary morning services of the Church on Sundays are met by the ready answer that separate services are therein joined together. Also, that of late years authority by Act of Parliament has been given for modification, as far as relates to the use or omission of the Litany. Is this latter procedure generally followed? Rather is it not in the main a dead letter, and does not old usage obtain very generally in the Evangelical and, to a considerable extent, in the High sections of the Church? True, Ritualists, less it may be in deference to episcopal precept than to Roman Catholic practice, have abbreviated—divided—such services. Be the motive what it may, let credit be given for the step which, in principle, must commend itself to thoughtful men.

We venture to submit that—(1) Prolixity; (2) Repetition in prayer, tend to sap its very foundation and object; and (3) To introduce the element of self-worthiness in a worshipper.

The pages of Scripture afford testimony negative, as well as positive, on these points.

Alike in Old and New Testament, if we except, as we may legitimately do, the prayer of Solomon at the dedication of the Temple—prayer which embraced the spiritual wants of a nation—it would seem that in proportion to the very brevity of supplication was the blessing vouchsafed in answer. In our direst necessities, perils, and dangers, we instinctively follow the example—often the very words—of the Publican. During the progress of grave, it may be of painful, disease, we know that prayer is intuitively, and necessarily, limited, to short, fervent utterances. And, when the hour of dissolution comes, the Christian narrows still further down his supplications to *a name* which is his creed, his gospel of salvation, his "All in all."

At other periods, indeed, it is not so. In health, with the special temptations which it brings; in the far more general state of bodily derangement and the temptations which *it* also brings, who cannot recognize conditions that call for such closet prayer as may not be limited to time nor words?

But any lengthened public worship is to be viewed in a different light. We take it to evidence, when analyzed in the light of Divine truth, an antagonism through which man's fallen nature asserts its empire over the heart, and introduces an element of self—a rag of creature righteousness—against the striving of the Holy Spirit. Faith is lacking, and compensation for deficient measure virtually claimed in the scrupulous or superstitious utterance of "many words." Is it not in some such aspect we may regard—regretfully, not uncharitably—the opposition of certain members of a congregation to shorter service? They claim an old-established right to the whole

ritual in which they have been brought up, and—to use a commercial figure—on full receipt go away self-satisfied.

We learn from our Lord's scathing denunciation of Pharisees, that long prayer *may* be a cloak to great sin: "vain repetition" and "much speaking," we also find condemned by the Saviour. Vain repetition—much speaking! Can anything bearing this semblance be found within the pale of the Church of England?

In an extreme section of our Church frequent service, frequent reiteration, obtains. When so hurried over that the value of time appears to be the first consideration; when, as a necessary consequence, a hasty mechanical assent is all that the mind can render; and when duty rather than privilege stamps the whole procedure, how far does it stand the test of examination in the light of Divine Wisdom? of Him who "knew what was in man?"

And, from a different standpoint, much the same results practically ensue from public worship as carried out by the other sections of our National Church—the main body of clergy.

It is not the object of the writer to consider in lengthened detail the Liturgy of the Church of England, beautiful and comprehensive as it is, taken as a whole, with reference to adaptibility to the wants of a congregation in the days we live in. A volume of wisdom and truth speaks to us in the very figures which span three centuries. Omitting no iota of doctrine, holding firmly to the principles of the Reformation, acknowledging fully the sound scriptural truth of the Articles on which the Prayer-book rests, the question, withal, is one that forces itself more and more on the attention of earnest men, alike clergy and laity, of the present day. Do we not hear of frequent Congresses which, if "much speaking" availed, should yield fruits? As yet we see blossom—which drops off again and again—not leaving even an immature "fig." Elasticity, to use a familiar term in party warfare, is indeed advocated from widely divergent bases and in very opposite directions. The professed objects, however, are the same—to bring men to Church—to save souls. Are these ends gained by existing means; *can* they be gained by them?

Thus far these remkars have applied rather to the highly educated members of "congregation." But what of the working classes? The percentage of church-goers among them in London,[1] has been recently brought prominently before the public. The statistics are appalling enough to paralyze the mind and efforts of the Bishop, and to justify the grave mis-

[1] Reference is only made to London. In a letter the writer has just received, he is informed that in a large manufacturing town in the North the percentage of those who attend any place of worship on Sundays is 9!

givings of the veteran philanthropist, Lord Shaftesbury, as to the future of the metropolis.

In duly weighing the great desideratum, spiritual edification of the masses with relation to the National Church, there are elements heretofore little recognized, almost ignored. These are the state of education, social status, and (*pari passu*) requirements of the nation at the Reformation period, contrasted with those of the 19th century. Who would venture to affirm that there is any parallelism? That any system of public worship albeit wisely and well adapted to meet the wants (as a whole) of an ignorant and superstitious people, living in disturbed times, and in an exceptional period of the Church's history, would be suitable for the present day? Yet, virtually, we act as though such were the case. To a future generation it may well appear surprising that recognition of a fact so patent and—more—action based on such recognition, were so long deferred. To touch but upon one bearing of the matter. There is an agency powerfully operative at the present day, wholly wanting then. This agency has assumed a predominant position at Church of England services in congregations widely opposed in tenets and character. It is the Hymn-book. To the higher classes associated with music it appeals strongly to the religious as well as to the æsthetic principles within. In them it cannot be easily determined how far "singing with the spirit and understanding," how far extraneous influences through the senses are concerned,—which predominate. Too close an introspection might evoke a greater, a more subtle, antagonism to Heavenly communion, only to be combatted by looking in child-like faith from self to a Saviour. That this latter element mingles a good deal with the devotional, especially among the young, as regards chants, anthems, oratorios—all that constitute "ornate worship," may reasonably be conceded. The fact remains that singing in its varied forms at public worship has established a great, an increasing hold, on congregations. This much admitted, it follows that any pre-existent need, assuming that there might have been such, for a lengthened liturgy, no longer obtains.

But what of Hymnology in relation to the lower orders—to the outside waifs and strays, ignorant and debased, who know not the Gospel, who come not to hear it, and to whom its messengers must go out among the lowest byways and hedges? Nothing less than an all-potent instrument and channel of Divine grace which first awakens, then feeds, spiritual life. Without the spell of Sacred music, again and again a chord is touched by the hand of a Divine Master, breathed upon by the Holy Spirit, and that melody of the heart which we know heralds a still higher harmony above, speaks of the return home to the Father of the "one sinner that repenteth." Well does

an old Divine, whose ministry was a great power generations ago, say, "The loveliest emblem of Heaven that I know upon earth is, when the people of God, in the deep sense of His excellency and bounty, from hearts abounding with love and joy, join together, both in heart and voice, in the cheerful and melodious singing of His praises."

It might not be wholly unprofitable for the Episcopal bench in the exercise of functions, grave indeed, both as Bishops and Legislators, to weigh outside utterances—the words especially of ministers of other Protestant denominations whose position frees them from the colour of party, and whose warm commendation of the Liturgy of the Church of England renders an opinion the more worthy of consideration. Dr. Norman M'Leod and Dr. Guthrie arrived at a like conclusion as to the material of effective public service, that it should include both prescribed and extempore prayer. To this view, in degree qualified as regards proportion of each, we fully concur. We would add a proviso that due consideration be given—1st, to avoidance of repetition, 2nd, to duration of service.

And surely this plan meets all the wants, fulfils all the essentials, of true worship. The congregation can join fervently in familiar words which they feel to clothe their Heavenward thoughts and aspirations, while opportunity is afforded the clergyman to include in subseqent short petitions such matters as either the particular subject of his discourse, particular "wants" in the well-being of his people, or, it may be, passing providential occurrence, render him desirous of pressing home. More, might not such procedure tend to bring into the fold of the National Church outsiders of the Nonconformist communities? who object to the hard and fast lines of a prayer-book, but yet, not unfrequently, so highly appreciate its beauties, as at the hand of their ministers to include portions of it in public devotions.

That the need of *some* departure from the "deadening" precedent of centuries exists, we have only to look around us. Why else the mission services, now so frequent and general, and which at the hands of one section of the Church seek to draw into the gospel-net not only lifeless members of the Establishment and "Heathen," but, perchance, stray fishes from other waters? Why else Missioners and Missions by clergy holding widely opposed doctrines but imbued with the same Christian spirit?

As exercising no light bearing on the subject which heads this paper, we would ask the question, "Does not the Church in her public offices overlook, ignore, the bodily condition of the individual worshipper, as regards receptivity for Divine truth, as well as for that office which George Herbert so beautifully renders, as,

"God's breath in man returning to his birth."

Much as the Liturgy in the mouth of a congregation assumes—alas! with what measure of sterling fact?—that all who utter the words are Christians like those of old in Antioch, so she acts virtually on the principle that members of a congregation are blessed in the fullest degree with a "Mens sana in corpore sano;" that all present are perfectly sound—well—all absent very much the reverse. Hence the capacity of mind for assimilation—the amount of spiritual food salutary for a congregation viewed in its entirety, so to speak, is not duly considered and weighed out. That very large class of individuals, particularly women—to say nothing of children—who are neither in robust health nor in definable sickness, is not allowed for. Strain such physique, either by spiritual or bodily over-effort, and the outcome is morbid—disease—mental or physical. The history of revivals illustrates this, as well as records of asylums. We by no means assert that such conseqences are to be especially laid at the door of the Church of England. Indeed, within her portals, there is ordinarily a sufficient safeguard against over-excitement of the brain. It is one that runs on a line not to be desired either by clergymen or laymen. For, if there be not during the long service, a recoil by the mind to mundane thought, a sense of weariness creeps in. The faculties which at the commencement can grasp freshly and fully the words of prayer, by reiteration, render a mechanical assent. Is it not so? and at the close of each Sunday, when we take a retrospect of the past hours, do we not with pain often confess as much?

Apart from more abstract general considerations, the season of the year, extremes of heat and cold—particularly the former—are no insignificant factors in the matter, and merit attention.

It may be urged that any fault lies, not with the Church—her services—but with the individual. Be it even so. Is it not true wisdom when things not essential are involved to allow for human weakness—to act in some measure on the lines of that great teacher and expert, St. Paul? Both letters and life show that *he* did not ignore the body in its just relation and subordination to the great object of his mission,—how he carried out the instructions of his Divine Master, and was "Wise as the serpent"—"Crafty to win souls." As a physician administers nutriment in quality and quantity suitable for diverse conditions of the digestion—an illustration aptly used by the Apostle[1]—viewing mal-administration the thing to be avoided, so did St. Paul, in public ministry and Epistles to the Churches, practise and enjoin. In one instance indeed we have a departure,

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 2.

or what appears to be such, from this principle. We read it in the 20th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and 9th verse. "And as Paul discoursed yet longer,[1] being borne down by his sleep, he (Eutychus) fell down from the third story, and was taken up dead." We can well understand how the apostle, on this exceptional occasion carried away alike by love to Christ and that tender human love—reflex of his Lord's—which so often finds expression,[2] lost sight of his own infirmities in the flesh as well as of those whom he addressed. Probably this lesson was not lost on him afterwards.

We take avoidance of repetition to be a principle essential to the objects of public worship—striking to its very foundation. Likewise, that such principle is based on the Bible, on human reason, and on human experience.

Let any one in his closet go reverentially and thoughtfully through the ordinary public services of the Prayer-book. Let him note, (1) Those petitions which in verbal entirety are repeated, (2) Those in which slight variation of word, none in purport, are employed.

As regards the latter, any hard and fast line would doubtless be a mistake. Some repetition there must be unless prayer, liturgical and extempore, be reduced to a dead level—automatic and dangerous in tendency—as in certain alien churches. Some synonymous word, some cardinal thought, will assert its mastery over the heart, will leaven the mind, will force expression, in true prayer. But withal, is there not both room and grounds for omission while leaving intact every truth and doctrine, every supplication and thanksgiving, evolved at the Reformation?

There are those indeed who would virtually place the Prayer-book on the same pedestal as the Bible, who would view with fear and aversion the transposition of a comma. They ignore the facts that it was the work of men, who, possessed of undeniable piety and Biblical light for the age in which they lived, were yet uninspired; that it may not be wholly free from a spirit of compromise on various points since clearly defined; and that three centuries of progress in knowledge, Divine and human, have set their mark on language and expression in prayer. It is surely somewhat puerile with reference to certain portions of that book, to assert, as some practically do when they explain them away, that words in the liturgies have one signification, and in lexicons and in the usages of society, another! Unwittingly it may be, do not such persons trench too near on Jesuitism?

If there be any one class of the community, high in position, and entitled to the deepest respect, among whom the axiom,

[1] New Version. [2] Philip. ii. 27.

"Quieta non movere," obtains, surely it is the bishops of our Church. Powerless, unhappily, to enforce law and discipline among the clergy, the words of the wise king[1] appear to be their refuge, and so with the ægis of the Latin saw, alike, points of doctrine scarcely dubious, and cummin and aniseed of tradition, are covered.

In the army we know that an officer and gentleman considers himself bound to obey those in command. Insubordination is unknown. The general is to him a judge whose word is law. It is otherwise with certain officers in the Church Militant. To laymen there is a fine irony when words of St. Paul and St. Peter on obedience to lawful authority fall from the lips of teachers and exemplars. But there is a yet graver aspect. We read in Macaulay's history that statesmen received King William's pay and served King James. And we know how posterity judges of *their* character.

To return to the former class of petition—viz., where in the entirety it is repeated over again during the same service. Is such procedure commendable, and, if so, on what grounds?

It will have occurred to all who have followed these remarks that there is one prayer in our Church service which stands pre-eminent—sublime in simplicity and power of diction, comprehensive in scope, adapted to the wants of mankind in every age. It is the prayer of prayers—"The Lord's Prayer." And surely every sentence, every word in it, apart from the great truths and lessons inculcated, is an argument in favour of the principle we would advocate—a standing protest against existing usage in the National Church. "After this manner" we are taught to pray. Practically, how widely we depart from it! Clergymen not infrequently deplore spiritual insensibility in the mass of their congregation, the absence of fruit from their ministry. In no carping spirit would we ask their consideration, among other possible hindrances, of those which proceed from within, and in which the pastor, rather than flock, are concerned.

In the foregoing pages it has been maintained that, on different grounds, reiteration in prayer is antagonistic to earnest public worship. If this inference be fairly deducible from—among such grounds—the pages of the Bible, in what light can we regard the frequent employment of the Lord's Prayer in each Sunday Service of our Church? It is repeated ordinarily four times, and, if we add the office of Holy Communion, five times, during Morning Service. Some of us too may recall days in our boyhood when, for a sixth time, the words were uttered before the sermon. Occasionally, even now, a clergyman of the

[1] Proverbs xxiv. 21.

old school who does so may be met with.[1] How many can say, after due introspection, that, *each* time, his heart rises to a full apprehension of, and response to, the petition? More, may not the officiating clergyman, as well as devout laymen—for of such latter we now speak—put the question to himself? For, whether it be from length of service in prayer, or—alas! that such conclusion should be sometimes *forced* on a congregation—motive less excusable than human infirmity—the words Divine are hurried over in a way that necessarily precludes anything save mere mechanical response.[2]

It is humiliating, yet not the less true, that Nonconformist ministers place the mirror before our clergy, and in more than one aspect. Enter a chapel, and you may hear the Lord's Prayer offered up *once*, devoutly, reverently, befittingly. The careless even may catch somewhat of the Spirit of Him who gave it, for the moment, and find his heart drawn upwards to the Father of all Mercies—the God of all Comfort. And contrast, as a rule, the elocution of men some of whom have struggled manfully through all the difficulties incident to insignificant social position and imperfect education, with that of clergymen trained at Universities. At the humblest Dissenting place of worship a stranger may feel assured that he will hear the Bible read feelingly, and prayer offered up in a reverential spirit. Can as much be said for *all* Church services? Monotone, sing-song, rapid utterance, is defended on the plea of relief to the voice—lessening of physical effort. Were prayer abbreviated and, so to speak, quality, not quantity, the consideration, such undesirable need would not exist. But why should not practical instruction in elocution, tested at the time of ordination, form part of the curriculum of a candidate for Holy Orders? In the other two liberal professions, progress—*utility*—have made their mark of late years in preparatory studies. Is the ministerial office alone so perfect as to admit of no improvement among its neophytes? As matters stand, defective delivery is so common as to be a matter of frequent comment by flippant Churchmen and inimical Dissenters. Reading is often stilted, the pitch of voice high, unnatural, and unmodified by the varied subject matter. One is reminded too often of some technical legal document, when necessarily gone through as a prelude to real business. Surely these things ought not to be.

Reverting to the Lord's Prayer, the question may perhaps, not

[1] "Baptism" and "churching" during Sunday services of course further lengthen the latter. Again, there is reiteration of the Lord's Prayer.

[2] A little girl, at L——d, after hearing the prayers thus rapidly gone through, said to her father, "If Jesus Christ had been here, He would have taken a scourge of small cords and driven that man out of the Temple."

unprofitably, be rendered thus: "How can I, under existing usage at public worship, realize the petition, enter into its spirit, strive against antagonisms?" It is one of those matters for the attempted solution of which each must look to his own heart. The writer tries to meet it, *not* unpreparedly, by apprehending, as far as may be, the prayer in its integrity when first offered, and, on subsequent repetitions, by dwelling mentally on one or other of the several sentences which shape the grand harmonious whole. Can we too profoundly and reverently search the depths of Divine Words, the first learned by infancy, the last uttered (often) by old age,—Words on which volumes have been founded?[1]

But is there no remedy for *misuse*—surely the phrase is not too strong—of this soul-stirring petition? We believe that a solution, very simple, is to be found—one of a nature to meet with general approval. Let those with whom authority legitimately rests be empowered to issue a mandate prohibiting usage of the Lord's Prayer oftener than once in each service of the Church, excepting on the occasion—now so frequent—when the celebration of the Holy Communion takes place.

Reference has been made to this Prayer as an illustration—meet indeed to take precedence—of the position into which custom has led us at the present day. If the foregoing principle be conceded, further argument is scarcely required to point its application to the component parts of Church service generally.

A step universally approved was taken some five years ago, when Parliamentary sanction was obtained for a modified use of the Litany—its optional exclusion on Sunday mornings. Add to this formula the General Thanksgiving, together with hymns and sermon, and a terse, admirable service for either afternoon or evening is afforded. Preferably the latter, inasmuch as a larger congregation attends, and from physical causes, sufficiently obvious, a condition of greater receptivity may be expected. Surely further concession, to meet exigencies increasingly recognized, might be sought for through the same channel.[2] The Liturgy of our Church has been well

[1] Some two years ago, a young nobleman lay on his deathbed, the sole occupant of a tent pitched in an African desert. He had been overtaken by fatal illness while hunting there with some brother officers, and, with no dear one to close his eyes, no ministry of religion, the hour of departure was come. Prolonged insensibility was broken, the voice was heard from without clearly and slowly repeating the words of Jesus, and then the spirit took its flight. A vision of infant years at a mother's knee it may have been to the dying man.

[2] The most profitable week-day service we can recall was that carried out in the Church of St. Mathias at Dublin, where the much lamented Dean Daunt was Incumbent. It consisted of the Litany, chapter from the New Testament, one or more hymns, and a short, earnest sermon.

designated "matchless." With an ascription of praise to the Triune God, such as the *Te Deum;* an embodiment of human wants and supplications, such as the Litany; and of gratitude to the Most High, such as the General Thanksgiving, what other uninspired system of worship can vie? It remains only to utilize such material—to readjust and abbreviate services to meet the altered circumstances of the present age.

The initiatory of the procedure might emanate from Convocation—in committee. The basis of such rearrangement is sufficiently patent, its object sufficiently manifest—edification.

A layman may well feel somewhat diffident in approaching details on this subject. We would submit, in such spirit, the following as among changes meet to be entertained:—

1. One of the Creeds to be used, at the option of the officiating minister (as in the American Episcopal Church).
2. One Collect for the Queen.
3. One reading of the Collect for the day.
4. That the response to the Ten Commandments be limited, as in the Commination Service, to the word "Amen," with the exception of the last inclusive one. Surely, a hearty, brief assent is preferable to the long-drawn sentence sung after *each* command, both as regards the worshipper and the time utilized.

The bishops of our Church have spoken of late on the high importance of an order of laymen—sub-deacon or evangelist—set apart to supplement ministerial work. Such persons are commissioned to hold short services, including prayers, hymns, and brief expositions of Scripture. A wise and timely measure, it may be admitted. The mass of the people do not come to church; the Church, in a generic sense, goes forth to them. Perhaps some little weakness in the ecclesiastical system might be inferred from this. But do their lordships consider the possibility that the lower orders, whether they be found in the alleys and dens or in the mechanic's room, for whom such necessarily brief —let us hope, earnest and hearty—services are designed, may little appreciate the lengthy Ordinances of the Sanctuary, to which the former is a stepping-stone?

We have already pleaded for relaxation in the direction of extempore prayer—literally "ex-tempore." The practice obtains, whether legal or otherwise, among some clergy of the Evangelical school, so far as the introduction of a few words in addition to —more occasionally substitution for—the usual collect before the sermon. And sometimes also such are heard after delivery, at a time when the preacher's heart is stirred, his sense of the value of immortal souls, as well as of his own responsibility as "a steward," quickened. Has any hearer ever wished such

words unsaid? Surely elasticity may be permissible at such times, and freshness of utterance, *with its acknowledged power to arrest attention*, be the gain.

And this leads us to the subject of duration of public service —what time it should cover. Clergymen are differently circumstanced in town and in country, and, if we set aside the calibre of the preacher, the position in life and surroundings of the congregation must needs affect the length of a sermon. What greater contrast can there be than, let us say, between the peasant or small farmer, who comes from a distance to church, and wistfully looks forward to his Sunday dinner, and the Templar, who, freed from such considerations, would gladly listen for an indefinite period to acute, logical reasoning, enforced by fluent speech. These are extremes. If we place the average entire service at from one hour and a quarter to an hour and a half we might consider two-thirds of such period applicable for prayer and praise, a third to the sermon.

One great principle alone should underlie all efforts to further an object of such solemn import as public worship. It is met with in St. John's Gospel, iv. 24.

Not without prayerful consideration, the outcome of many years, has the writer approached his subject in the light of these words.

There are, indeed, profound difficulties to the untrammelled minds of Christian laymen when they seek to harmonize the Church based on the Apostolic mould with a Church in the age in which we live. Not with the scepticism of a heathen governor or philosopher, but rather with the mind of that Apostle who spoke of an undivided Christ, must he, too, supplicate the Spirit of Truth to guide him into all truth. For he knows that the day will come when the fiat everlasting will depend upon such apprehension in relation, directly and individually, to the Judge Himself. While here below, he will—wisely, for the avoidance of an otherwise inevitable chaos—be identified with a recognized scriptural pastorate and church government. Yet, rising above sectarianism to some conception, however dim, of the Church of Divine Writ—the Church Catholic—he sees in all its branches below, the word "imperfection" indelibly stamped. May he not withal in humble faith recognize, albeit dimly, the purpose of the All-Wise, All-Good, thus drawing us from the finite to the Infinite, from the Church on earth to the Church triumphant? "the multitude which no man may number."

At the present age we find man, on the one hand, demanding such demonstration—analysis—of Scripture as would virtually supersede all faith, and on the other resting on a superstition which would ignore the faculties with which God has gifted him, and, with such gift, the responsibilities thereby created. Thus

alike, in the so-called empire of reason, or in that other sovereignty which arrogates to itself attributes of the Most High, truly we behold impious man "as God, sitting in the Temple of God, declaring himself to be God."

At least, so far as the ascription of praise and prayer in the Sanctuary reaches, and, with it, the highest aim, the worthiest means, by which worship in spirit and truth may be affected, the path is open. Here, surely, difficulties are not insuperable. The idols of tradition and conventionality have to be encountered and overthrown. Should that disestablishment, which some bishops already speak of as a question of brief years, arrive, the sifting of wheat from the chaff in public worship must needs begin, and the great question from without, as well as from within, her pale be, not only "What the Church says," but, also, "What can the Church do?"

Is it not preferable to be timely wise?

FREDERICK ROBINSON.

ART. II.—"ALMS AND OBLATIONS."

IN offering to the readers of THE CHURCHMAN at the beginning of its new year (and I hope the new year will be for it one of continued prosperity and increasing usefulness) an argument on what I believe to be the true meaning of the phrase "*Alms and Oblations*" in our Book of Common Prayer, I write in the first person, partly because the subject has come before my notice in a somewhat personal manner; and partly because, taking a keen interest in liturgical studies, and yet wishing to avoid all approach to a show of learning, I find it more natural and easy to write in this way than in any other.

It happened to me, a few years ago, in the course of preaching certain sermons, which the Restoration of Chester Cathedral rendered desirable, and for which the great kindness of Clergymen in the Diocese gave frequent opportunities, to encounter two contrasted experiences, which I remember very well. In each case it occurred that the offertory for the Cathedral Restoration was taken on a Sunday morning, when there was no administration of the Holy Communion. At one end of the Diocese the Parish Priest (a moderate Low Churchman, if I may use a detestable cant phrase), on presenting upon the Lord's Table the offerings of the people, prayed that our "oblations" might be accepted, the word "alms" being omitted from the formula which is prescribed. I saw at once the thought that was in his mind. He knew that the collection was not for the

sick and poor, but for Church purposes: he knew, too, that by direction of the rubric it was to be "reverently brought," and "humbly presented and placed." Hence he altered the prescribed form of words to fit his opinion. On a second similar occasion, at the other end of the Diocese, when the general facts of the service and the collection were the same, the Parish Priest (a moderate High Churchman, to use a phrase which to me is equally detestable) followed exactly the contrary course. He evidently viewed the word "oblations" as denoting the Bread and Wine, when placed on the Holy Table for Communion, and as being restricted to that sense only. Hence he, too, altered the appointed formula, but in the opposite way, by omitting the word "oblations," notwithstanding that the collection was not intended for the relief of suffering or poverty. Now which of these two Clergymen was right? Both were excellent, laborious, loyal men: and yet they treated in two discordant ways a rule which appears to be perfectly plain. I feel no hesitation in saying that both were wrong, but that the latter was more wrong than the other. In every offertory the sums of money collected from the congregation and solemnly presented are literally "oblations;" they are not, however, in all cases, literally "alms:" though the prescribed collective phrase "alms and oblations," like the "decent bason," which is directed to be used for the alms and "other devotions of the people," includes both, suits every variety of occasion, raises no questions, and converts into a religious offering all that is thus collected and placed.

In drawing out my argument in favour of this view, I will present it under ten separate and detached heads. This may appear somewhat formal: but it will promote clearness; and in this way it will more easily be seen what each point of the argument is worth. Even separately, every one of them appears to me to be of considerable weight: while, when they are all taken together, I think they are absolutely demonstrative and conclusive.

1. At the last revision, which made our Prayer Book what it is, there is no doubt that some members of the Church of England, and some very important and influential members, desired that the unconsecrated Bread and Wine in the Communion Service should be formally and expressly made an "oblation." To illustrate some questions of this kind, we have very peculiar and valuable evidence in the existence of certain Prayer Books with manuscript notes, which were used in preparation for this revision, or during its process. The most important of these books is the "Photozincographic facsimile of the Black Letter Prayer Book of 1636, with marginal manuscript notes and alterations," which was subscribed in 1661 by the Convocations of Canterbury and York and annexed to the

Act of Uniformity 13 & 14 Car. II. c. 4. This book is like a battlefield still fresh from the struggle, where we can see from what lies on the ground how the contention wavered to and fro, and in what way it was finally decided. Thus, to note what we observe in a neighbouring part of the book, we find that, in the rubric preceding the prayer which immediately follows the offertory, the words, "the good estate of the Catholic Church of Christ," were proposed instead of the words, "the whole Estate of Christ's Church Militant here on earth," which were there before, and which are there again now. Had the proposed change been accepted by Convocation and Parliament, this prayer might have reasonably been viewed as including public prayers for the dead, instead of excluding them, as is now the case.[1] So with the subject before us. In the present instance, however, the evidence is supplied, not by this book, but by the book preserved at Durham, which contains Bishop Cosin's preliminary notes, and the book preserved in the Bodleian Library, which contains Sancroft's preliminary notes. These three books ought to be brought carefully together, and every minute particular that comes to view on comparison should be noted and recorded. This, so far as I know, has never been done. As regards the point before us, the question seems to have been settled before the final debates were reached. We are concerned only with the result. And the result is this, that though the phrase "offer up" as well as "place," in imitation of the Scotch Prayer Book of 1637, was strongly urged by both Cosin and Sancroft,[2] this proposal was decisively rejected: and there appears in the margin of the first-mentioned newly-discovered book, simply the rubric as we have it now. The plan for inserting the expression "offer up" had been considered and refused. And if it was not permissible to use this expression, then it cannot have been intended that the placing of the unconsecrated Bread and Wine was intended to be made an "oblation." If they were not an "offering" they were not an "oblation." The words are synonymous. Let it be remembered, too, that what we have to do with here is not a mere casual careless rule, but a rubric adopted after serious debate and careful thought. The present rule embodies the deliberate

[1] It must not, however, be forgotten that the concluding part of this prayer, which is so full of solace for the bereaved, was added at the last revision.

[2] Cosin's proposed rubric ran thus: "*If there be a Communion, the "Priest shall offer up and place the Bread and Wine in a comely paten "and chalice upon the Table, that they may be ready for the Sacrament, "as much as he shall think fit.*"—See vol ii. p. 55 of his Correspondence, as published by the Surtees Society. For the similar proposal of Sancroft, see Cardwell's "History of Conferences," p. 390.

rejection of a proposal that the placing of the Bread and Wine should be made an oblation.

2. Reference has already been made to the Scottish Prayer Book of King Charles I. and Archbishop Laud. A careful inspection of this book may with great advantage be made the second point in this argument. In two very important senses—partly by contrast and partly by suggestion[1]—this book may with much truth be said to have been the precursor of our present English Book. Some things appeared in the former of these books which are very distinctly rejected in the later, and thus proofs are furnished of the mind of the Church of England on certain important particulars. On the other hand, there are some things in our Book of 1662, the first intimations of which are to be found in the Scotch Book of 1637. We have seen that the "offering" or "oblation" of the unconsecrated elements, contained in the former, is rejected in the latter. But this is by no means the only part of the contents of the Scotch Book which has an important bearing on the question before us. On comparison we find suggestion as well as contrast. The rubric relating to the offertory in the Scotch book, immediately before the prayer for the Church Militant, runs thus:—"*While the Presbyter distinctly pronounceth some or all of these sentences for the offertory, the Deacon, or (if no such be present) one of the Churchwardens, shall receive the devotions of the people there present in a bason provided for that purpose. And when all have offered, hee shall reverently bring the said bason with the oblations therein, and deliver it to the Presbyter, who shall humbly present it before the Lord, and set it upon the Holy Table.*" Here we observe three important particulars—first, that the terms "oblation" and "offering" are co-ordinated as being synonymous; secondly, that the "oblations" mean the same thing as the "devotions of the people," and, thirdly, that these "oblations" are placed in the "bason," and are in the bason presented. Nothing could be more clear or unequivocal than the sense in which the term is here employed by Archbishop Laud; and it is made all the more conspicuous by the fact that, as we have seen, there is prescribed in the book a separate oblation of the unconsecrated Bread and Wine. It is worth while also to remark that in one respect this rubric is stronger than ours in expressing the religious principle involved in this employment of the word "oblations." They are not simply to be reverently brought, and humbly presented, but they are to be presented "before the Lord."

---

[1] Under the head of suggestion may properly be included the fact that, in harmony with the New Testament, "Presbyter" is here given as the true explanation of the ambiguous term "Priest."

The whole of the argument, however, derivable for our purpose from the Scotch book is not yet exhausted. At the end of this section of it we find the following rubric:—"*After the Divine Service ended, that which was offered shall be divided in the presence of the Churchwardens, whereof one half shall be to the use of the Presbyter, to provide him books of holy divinity; the other half shall be carefully kept and employed in some pious or Christian use, for the decent furnishing of that Church, or the publike relief of their poore, at the discretion of the Presbyter and the Churchwardens.*" Here the points of importance are the collective character of that which is included under the term "oblations" and placed together in the bason, and the divisibility afterwards of this fund for co-ordinate purposes of different kinds. Part is viewed as an offering to the Clergy for a specific (and, we may add, a very important) use; part is to be applied to the requirements of the church fabric and to the alleviation of the necessities of the poor.

3. But let us pause here on one feature of the case which has a separate argumentative value of its own. In our own Prayer Book all that was suggested by the Scotch Book, in regard to our offerings at the Holy Communion for the poor and for Church purposes, may be said to have been fully considered and brought to maturity. Let us now, therefore, compare the two rubrics which relate to these Offerings on the one hand, and the Bread and Wine on the other. The two rubrics are set side by side. They both appeared first in their present place, and in their present form of expression, at the last revision. Could any contrast be sharper and more instructive than that which distinguishes these two rubrics from one another? That which is gathered from the people in the congregation is to be "reverently brought" and "humbly presented." The very words are a sermon. They are evidently meant to inculcate a truth, to enforce a duty, and to assert a principle. Whatever sympathy there may be for the suffering and the poor, whatever zeal for church building and church adornment, and for the support and dignity of the Clergy, all that is brought together at this time under such motives is to be made likewise an offering to Almighty God. But how different is the other rubric! It is simply this: "*When there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient.*" It is merely a direction for convenience and propriety. There was previously no rule as to the time when, and the person by whom, the unconsecrated elements were to be "placed upon the Table." The right time is evidently when the ante-Communion service is over, and when the remainder of the service is about to become strictly the Communion Office: and can it be doubted that the right

person to do this ministerial act is the officiating Clergyman? But is it credible, if the placing of the Bread and Wine upon the Table was intended to be viewed as a solemn offering to Almighty God, that language would be used, so bare and mean, and so strangely contrasted with the language used in the other case, where the doctrine and practice of oblation are expressly asserted and taught?

4. Once more (and it may be well, in a few simple words, to state this point separately), that which is presented on the Lord's Table during the Communion Service, with injunctions of such solemnity, is gathered at the time, under the influence of devotional feeling, from the worshippers. "*The Bread and Wine for the Communion*" are, as we learn from a rubric at the close of the service, to be "*provided by the Curate and Churchwardens at the charges of the Parish.*" The force of this contrast will be variously estimated by different students of the Prayer Book. To me it appears one of high significance; and I lay special stress on this, that it corresponds with the other contrast which has just been considered. The harmony of our Book of Common Prayer, as to provisions which were very carefully considered and deliberately adopted in 1661, is a feature of the case deserving of the utmost attention. I will not add more of my own as regards this particular, but I will simply quote what is said respecting it by two of our eminent modern liturgical scholars. Dr. Blakeney's words are these:—"The communicants do not present the elements; one of the Communion rubrics directs that the bread and wine shall be provided at the charge of the parish; but the prayer refers to the voluntary offerings of the communicants, who do not embrace the whole parish, the charge upon which does not necessarily imply a free-will offering."[1] Mr. Procter, after quoting the contemporary French Version of Durel in favour of his view, simply puts the matter thus:—"Whatever is included in the term *oblation* has been received from the people in the bason, whether simply for the poor, or for the minister, or for the service of the church, or for any charitable use; the elements for Communion are not so gathered from the people."[2]

5. I now come to a point of the argument which with all archæological students must, I should imagine, have great weight. There was during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries a recognized ecclesiastical meaning of the term "oblations," which on that account merely it is natural to connect with the

[1] "The Book of Common Prayer, with its History and Interpretation," third edition, p. 453.

[2] "History of the Book of Common Prayer, with a Rationale of its Offices," fourteenth edition, p. 531.

occurrence of the word in this place. As to the general fact, I will cite an authority whom certainly no one can accuse of a prejudice in the direction of the present line of argument. Sir Robert Phillimore says, in his elaborate work on the Ecclesiastical Law of the Church of England, "*Offerings* and *oblations* are one and the same thing. . . . . The term *oblations*, in the Canon Law, means whatever is in any manner offered to the Church by the pious and faithful." But perhaps it is still more to my purpose to adduce instances of the casual and incidental use of the word; for such instances show what was accepted as a matter of course during that period of our history. I will give simply two illustrations of this kind. In the old statutes of Chester Cathedral (dated 1544) part of the duty of the Sacrist is defined thus:—"*Oblationes etiam in Templo, si quæ fuerint, recipiet et in usum Ecclesiæ nostræ tradendas servabit.*" In another part of the same statute, but quite separately, and under a different head, he is directed to provide the wine and whatever else may be necessary for Divine Service. The other example shall be taken from an unexpected source, a hundred years later. In Herrick's "Fairie Temple" we find the following lines:—

> Now, we must know, the elves are led
> Right by the Rubrick, which they read:
> And if report of them be true
> They have the text for what they do,
> Aye, and their book of Canons too.
> * * * * *
> The Bason stands the Board upon
> To take the free Oblation.
> * * * * *
> The elves in formal manner fix
> Two pure and holy canddlesticks,
> In either which a tall small bent
> Burns for the Altar's ornament.
> For sanctity, they have to these
> Their curious copes and surplices
> Of cleanest cobweb, hanging by,
> In their religious vesterie.[1]

The context has been sufficiently quoted to show that the whole spirit of the poem is not Puritanical, but very much the contrary. Yet we clearly see here not only the Oblation, but the Bason which is to receive it. With such passages before us, can we really feel any doubt as to the meaning of the word under our consideration? Is it not reasonable, and even necessary, to interpret it according to the habit of the time? Why is a new

[1] "Hesperides," vol. i. p. 125.

sense to be "read into it," if I may use an expression which has been very familiar to us of late?

6. But I now invite attention not simply to the old usage of the word "oblations," but to a certain manner of employing the collective phrase, "alms and oblations." This may be exemplified by instances taken from three very different periods. The first dates from the year 1547, two years before the issuing of King Edward the Sixth's First Prayer Book. In the Injunctions put forth by that Prince to the Clergy and Laity, we find it directed that a chest is to be placed in each church, "to the intent the parishioners should put into it their oblation and alms for their poor brethren." It is pointed out that "to relieve the poor is a true worshipping of God." In regard "to which alms and devotion of the people," careful regulations are laid down for their distribution to the "most needy neighbours:" and it is further provided that part of the contents of this chest may be "bestowed upon the reparation of the church, if great need require."[1] We observe here, at this early date, the same features of the case as those which are so prominently marked in our present Prayer Book, with the one exception that these gifts are not made a public offering in Divine Service. "Alms and oblations" are co-ordinated in one phrase: this phrase is used as synonymous with "alms and devotion:" and two different, though parallel, modes of applying the collective fund are contemplated.

The Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth have recently been mixed up with much angry controversy in this country. I have no intention of touching them here in that respect. I only invite attention to the fact that, in 1559, just a year after a very important revision of the Second Prayer Book of King Edward VI., that monarch's words, in regard to the subject before us, are reproduced identically by Queen Elizabeth. The order for fixing the chest in the church, the use of the same phrases, with this slight difference, that here they are "oblations and alms" and "alms and devotions," and the permission to apply to church reparation part of a fund primarily intended for the relief of the poor, are found again.[2] Still, however, the principle of religious offering was not embodied in the rules for Public Service.

From the earlier parts of this period of about a hundred and fifty years we may now turn to the later. All who are acquainted with English Church History are aware that, if the authority of Cosin and Sancroft can be quoted for a point like this, such authority is very worthy of attention. Now there is extant a form of consecration for Churches and Chapels, drawn up by the former of these prelates, for use in his Diocese: and

[1] Cardwell's "Documentary Annals," vol. i. pp. 18, 19.
[2] Cardwell, *ibid.* p. 190.

in this form we find the following direction: "*Then shall the Bishop reverently offer upon the Lord's Table, first, the Act of consecrating the Church or Chappell under his seale before published, then the Bread and Wine for the Communion, and then his own alms and oblations. . . . . Then one of the Priests shall receive the Alms and Oblations.*"[1] We have seen that the second of these three oblations was disallowed by Convocation and Parliament. This, however, only makes more prominent the separate use of the form of expression which is now under consideration.

I now pass to 1686, when Sancroft was Archbishop, and when that principle of religious offering had been formally expressed in the Prayer Book under circumstances in which he had been very actively engaged. One of his questions in his Articles of Inquiry is this: "When the Holy Communion is administered amongst you, are the alms and oblations of devout persons duly collected and received? Are they constantly disposed of to pious and charitable uses by the consent of the Minister and Churchwardens, or, if they disagree, by the appointment of the Ordinary?"[2] Here the word "devout" makes the term "oblations" synonymous with "devotions," while the "collecting" and "receiving" utterly separate the term from all connection with the Bread and Wine. In fact, Sancroft, who, sixteen years before, when Chaplain to the Bishop of Durham, pleaded earnestly for the expression of one kind of oblation in the Liturgy, and pleaded in vain, did not on that account hesitate to insist firmly on that other kind of oblation, to which liturgical sanction had been given.

7. This seems the natural place for setting out another section of the argument, which is necessary for the completeness of the whole. Throughout all the range of the history of the subject, from the dawn of the Reformation to the period of the Revolution, there is a parallelism between "alms" and "oblations," which appears at every point, till the parallelism becomes contact also, when both classes of gifts are officially made one combined offering. Let us examine, with this point in view, our successive English Prayer Books in order.

In 1549 there was a box to receive the offerings intended

---

[1] Form and Order of Dedication or Consecration of Churches and Chappells. See vol. ii. of "Cosin's Correspondence" (Surtees Society), p. 109. We have no means of knowing when this form of service was first compiled. It is said to have been used in 1668; but we have no reason for believing that it was so used as to contradict the Prayer Book; nor does this question at all affect the point before us, which relates only to the use of one phrase.

[2] See Appendix to Second Report of Royal Commission on Ritual p. 654.

as alms for the poor, and Offering Days were prescribed for what was contributed towards the sustentation of the Clergy. The rubric preceding the sentences is worthy of notice, in the first place, because of the manner in which we find the word "offer" there employed. "*Then shall follow for the Offertory one or more of these sentences of Holy Scripture, to be sung while the people do offer; or else one of them to be said by the minister immediately before the offering.*" A subsequent rubric contains the following: "*While the Clerks do sing the Offertory as many as are disposed shall offer to the poor man's box, every one according to his ability and charitable mind; and at the offering days appointed, every man and woman shall pay to the Curate the due and accustomed offerings.*"

In the later books of 1552, 1559, and 1604, the Prayer for the Church Militant is appointed to be used after the offertory; but only "Alms for the poor" are named in that prayer and in the direction at the side, the custom of paying the Oblations to the Clergy on "offering days," being still continued. The rubric throughout this period runs thus; "*Then shall the churchwardens, or some other by them appointed, gather the devotion of the people, and put the same into the poor man's box; and upon the offering days appointed every man and woman shall pay to the Curate the due and accustomed offerings.*"

Finally, when we come to the revision of 1662, and when the poor man's box and the offering days have disappeared, this parallelism still runs through the service. In the rubric before the Prayer for the Church Militant we find "alms and other devotions:" in the prayer itself we find "alms and oblations:" and in a rubric at the close of the service we find it directed that what has been collected and offered shall be applied to "pious and charitable uses." But this is not all. The offertory sentences themselves are an expression of this parallelism in its most emphatic form. Some are general; some have reference to the poor and sick, with no adaptation to Church purposes; some have reference to Church purposes, with no adaptation to the poor and the sick. Here it is much to the purpose to quote the words used, in one of his recently published Notes, by Bishop Wren, who was contemporary with the last revision, and took an important part in it. "These sentences now are all the same here that were before, but the order of their standing is a little different; to this purpose, that as they are now ordered, the seven that stand first will appear to be in general for all charitable gifts; the seven next to tend particularly to that which they called *Prosphora*, in the Primitive Church—that is, a free-will offering unto God: and the six last, to be especially for the *Eleemosyna*—that is, an Alms Deed to the Poor."

We may now with advantage consider the circumstances

under which the directions of our present Prayer Book on this subject were introduced. One chief characteristic of the last revision was that it supplied directions in various points of detail which were left in an uncertain condition before. Thus, the breaking of the bread in the act of consecration (in pursuance of suggestions which came, very curiously and very instructively, alike from Baxter and Cosin) was for the first time directed at this date. To the same revision belongs the direction for Baptism: "*Then* shall the Font be filled with water," which is a rule for one sacrament corresponding with the rule for the other: "The Priest shall *then* place" the Bread and Wine. So with regard to the offertory collection. An improvement was made in this matter, too, as to the rules for manual acts. The churchwardens, indeed, or others appointed by them, had, in the earlier books, been directed to gather the alms of the people, and to place them in the poor man's box; and the offering days were definitely fixed. But everything was made more precise and more reverent, to say nothing of the new assertion of a great principle, when it was appointed that a decent bason shall be ready for the receiving of all these offerings, of whatever kind they might be, and the placing of the whole collectively on the Lord's Table.

9. I now ask attention to a feature of this part of our Service Book, which seems to come, with great simplicity, but with very great force, to clench all the preceding parts of the argument. There may be an offertory without a communion: and all the instructions as regards the offerings of the people remain the same as though there were a communion. "When there is a Communion," then Bread and Wine are to be placed on the Holy Table. But when there is not, the prayer for the Church Militant, with its contents and its marginal and included notes, remains precisely the same. There may or may not be a collection; and if there be a collection, it may be for the sick and the poor, or it may be for Church purposes, or it may be indeterminate, the application of it remaining to be determined according to the rule stated at the end of the service. But if there is no Communion, it is impossible that the word "oblation" can refer to Bread and Wine, which are not there and are not required. Nothing could more expressly separate the word "oblation" from all reference to the unconsecrated elements. It would have been quite easy to say: "If there be no Communion, then shall the word *oblations* be omitted." But nothing of the kind is said. Hence, when we remember how carefully all manual acts were defined at the last revision, we may be sure that nothing of the kind was intended; and those who at such times omit the word, violate a clear and simple rule.

But a further remark on this part of the subject brings me

back to the point at which I started. Under no circumstances is it allowable to alter the collective phrase "alms and oblations," which is prescribed. It may be quite certain that the collection has no reference to the relief of the poor and the sick: but this does not justify the omission of the word "alms." Whether these be alms *or* oblations, whatever the destination of the offertory may be, whether it is definite or indefinite, the whole of the prescribed formula "alms and oblations" must be used. No questions are asked at this moment, though the word "oblation" does indeed lay its sacred hand on the whole of what is collected and convert it into an offering to the Lord. To omit that word is to attenuate one great religious lesson of the occasion: while, as has been shown, the omission of the word from this place mentally transfers it to the place from which it has been by Church-authority excluded. To put the matter briefly, the Priest, in receiving the offerings of the people, has no more right to bisect the formula, than he has to break the bason in which the offerings are reverently brought and humbly presented.

10. My tenth point shall be this, that on this view of the meaning of the word "oblations" which has here been presented, everything became consistent; whereas the other theory, which identifies them with the unconsecrated Bread and Wine, introduces contradiction at every point. It contradicts history: it condemns those who presided over the last revision of the Prayer Book, of doing very loosely and carelessly that which they were bound to do with the utmost care and exactitude; and it forces the Clergy to break a rule which is laid down in the clearest manner. Moreover, this mode of dealing with the plain letter of the Prayer Book furnishes a sanction for a similar mode of dealing with other parts.

I know that this argument will by some be met by a general sweeping objection—that some will set it on one side for these simple reasons; that the earlier Liturgies had an oblation of the unconsecrated elements; that the Church of England must be in harmony with the early Church; and that therefore we must have in our Liturgy this oblation, whether it is clearly expressed or not; hence that, no other way of securing this expression being possible, the word "oblations" in the place before us must have this signification. To this I think it quite enough to reply that, because it is not thought worth while to answer an argument, it does not therefore follow that the argument does not require an answer. My purpose has been simply to inquire what our Prayer Book says and means in one particular. So far, we have no concern with the liturgies of other ages and other countries. They may, or may not be in harmony with ours. If they differ from ours, we may, or may not, be wrong. I have only been

investigating the facts of the case. Our allegiance, too, is due to our own Liturgy, and not to any other. With this objection before me, I am reminded of a story of a Bishop and a young clergyman. Some usage, which the Bishop did not approve, was in question: and the young clergyman quoted St. Augustine as his authority; to which the Bishop replied, "I am your Bishop, and not St. Augustine." Yet, lest these sentences should seem too dogmatic, I will end as I began, with a reference to this Diocese. Those who are minutely acquainted with it would easily select two among its Clergy, who, taken together, are, for venerable age, for varied opportunities, for wide observation, for learning and acuteness, unquestionably pre-eminent; and they altogether agree with the view which I have endeavoured to make clear, though for the laying out of the argument I alone am responsible.

But finally, this aspect of oblation at the Holy Eucharist, though negatively it may have little connection with some Liturgies of early ages, is, when viewed on its positive side, in strict harmony with Holy Scripture: and harmony with Holy Scripture is surely of more vital consequence than resemblance to liturgical forms, which, though ancient, are subsequent to the time of the Apostles. No Church in Christendom declares more emphatically than ours that the offering of our substance is properly a part of Divine worship; for not only is the act of giving made customary during our most sacred service, but it is associated with the most expressive liturgical language. We are admonished in this way that our gifts are to be viewed, not merely as a result of human charity, but as a sacrifice to Almighty God. In no way could we better fulfil such precepts as those which we read in the Epistles: "On the first day of the week let every one lay by him in store, as God has prospered him:" "To do good and to communicate, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."

J. S. Howson.

Art. II.—CHRISTMAS EVANS.

In the articles on "The Church in Wales," which appeared two years ago in this Magazine, written by Canon Powell Jones, mention is made of Rowlands of Llangeitho, Williams of Pantycelyn (the poet), Peter Williams (the commentator), Howel Harries of Trevecca, Griffith Jones of Llanddrownor, Charles of Bala, Jones, Rector of Llangan, and other eminent Christian workers in the Principality. Griffith Jones, Rector of Llanddrownor, was the first and foremost among the Welsh

revivalists of the last century; he is called, indeed, the "Morning Star of the Revival." Ordained by Bishop Bull in the year 1708, he devoted himself with earnest zeal to the duties of the Ministry, working on the lines of his Church. He was a powerful preacher, an able writer, and a great promoter of elementary schools; he catechized as well as preached, and he took as the basis of his instruction the Church Catechism.[1] In literary attainments not one of the Welsh revivalists can be compared to him, except the Rev. Thomas Charles, of Bala, one of the founders of the British and Foreign Bible Society. Charles was born in 1755, six years before the death of Griffith Jones. These two good men belonged to the same revival, and had caught the same flame which kindled their hearts; but they laboured upon different lines; and the effect of the divergent courses which they pursued is felt in Wales at the present day. The manual for catechising, published by Mr. Jones, was an exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England; but Mr. Charles, in his manual, cut up for himself fresh ground, and chose a new path. Wherever the influence of Mr. Jones has remained, there a connection exists between the Church and the people, but wherever the teaching of Mr. Charles is in the ascendancy, the link is broken and the connection lost.[2]

Griffith Jones, as we have said, died in the year 1761. Christmas Evans, the great Welsh preacher, whose biography, just published, is now before us,[3] was born in 1766. The author of this biography, Mr. Paxton Hood, an esteemed and able writer, one of the most eminent Congregationalist preachers of the day, deals mainly, as is natural, with the features of the Welsh revival, which may be termed, for lack of a better word, Noncon-

---

[1] He was the honoured instrument of the conversion of Daniel Rowlands. Rowlands, a Curate, at that time a proud and self-sufficient young man, assumed a defiant attitude in the crowded church; but the prayer of the Preacher went home.

[2] The successors of Griffith Jones in the great revival did not follow in his footsteps. Their position with regard to the Church, indeed, was different to his: they encountered greater opposition from the Bishops and clergy. Also, they did not possess his peculiar gifts, his learning, his statesmanlike sense and judgment, his administrative powers. Of the blind bigotry of the Bishops and clergy, and of the gentry, one cannot read even in the present day without indignation, shame, and amazement. For the separation of the Methodists from the Church of their fathers the Lay and Clerical Churchmen of influence throughout the country were undoubtedly responsible.

[3] "Christmas Evans: the Preacher of Wild Wales. His Country, his Times, and his Contemporaries." By Paxton Hood, Author of "Thomas Carlyle," "Robert Hall," "Vignettes of the Great Revival," &c. Pp. 410. Hodder & Stoughton.

formist. Of the far-famed Daniel Rowlands, who loyally loved the Church of his fathers, and throughout his life continued attached to her services, he says very little; concerning the Rector of Llanddrownor, Griffith Jones, we have noticed an incidental line. Of the twelve chapters in the book, three are devoted to eminent Welsh preachers, contemporaries of Christmas Evans—viz., Williams of Wern, John Elias, and Davies of Swansea. In another chapter, headed "The Preachers of Wild Wales," we find brief sketches of Howell Harries, Ebenezer Morris, Davies of Castell Hywel, the first Pastor of Christmas Evans, and others. As a picture of the Welsh revival, Mr. Paxton Hood's work, as we have pointed out, is not, historically speaking, quite complete. It is, however, a graphic and very pleasing portraiture of the preacher and the period to which the author has devoted himself; it is, in fact, a biography, but it fairly answers to its title, "Christmas Evans: his Country, his Times, and his Contemporaries."

Preaching is, in Wales, the great national characteristic. This is the key-note statement of Mr. Hood's introductory chapter. The state of mind in Wales, he says, is a state of "feeling, and of poetry, and of subtle questionings, high religious musings, and raptures. This state has been aided by the secludedness of the country, and the exclusiveness of the language, not less than by the rugged force of masculine majesty and strength of the language,[1] . . . a language admirably fitted to move like a wind over the soul, rousing and soothing, stirring into storm, and lulling into rest. Something in it makes an orator almost ludicrous when he attempts to convey himself in another language, but

[1] On the expressiveness of the Welsh language, Mr. Hood makes some just and pertinent remarks. And those who have studied Welsh, or listened to its speakers and singers, will agree with him, probably, that it yields to no language in softness and sweetness. It is a curious fact, that the Welsh language possesses a poem of eight lines in which there is not a single consonant. An epigram on the Spider, dating from the 17th century, stood thus:

O'i wiw ŵy i weu e â, o'i au, O'i wyau y weua;
E wywa ei we' aua', A'i weuai y'w ieuau ia.

The Welsh language, it must be remembered, has seven vowels, both *w* and *y* being considered and sounded as such. To the above lines the great Gronwy Owen added a kind of counterchange of vowels, and the translation has been given as follows:—

From out its womb it weaves with care
Its web beneath the roof:
Its wintry web it spreadeth there—
Wires of ice its woof.

And doth it weave against the wall
Thin ropes of ice on high?
And must its little liver all
The wondrous stuff supply?

very powerful of impression in that." Again, it must be remembered, that, "until very recently, the pulpit in Wales has been the only means of popular excitement, instruction, or even of entertainment." The Welsh have dwelt among their own people; they have possessed no popular fictions, no published poems, no published emanations, either of metaphysics or natural science. Yet there was a large consciousness; uneducated as they were the people had strong religious instincts. It may be said, therefore, "that religion, as represented through the men of the pulpit, has made Wales what she is."

Three-fourths of any amount of power which the Revivalist preachers obtained over their countrymen and countrywomen arises, says Mr. Hood, from the fact that the Welsh possess, in an eminent degree, what may be termed a religious nature; they are very open to wonder: they have a most keen and curious propensity to enquire into the hidden causes of things: the Unseen Universe is a mystery over which they cannot but brood. "When, therefore, the earnest voice of their native speech became the vehicle for unfolding the higher doctrines of the Christian life, the sufferings of the Redeemer, and their relation to eternal laws and human conditions, probably a people was never found whose ears were more open, or whose hearts were more ready to receive, and to be stirred to their utmost depths. Their religion—evangelical religion—became the very life of the land of Wales."

"Within my memory," writes our author, "religion was the one topic upon which you might talk intelligently anywhere in Wales: with the pitman in the coal-mine, with the iron-smelter at the forge, with the farmer by his ingleside, with the labourer in his mountain shieling; and not merely on the first mere elementary lessons of the catechism, but on the great bearings and infinite relations of religious things."

No person can have heard anything of the Welsh religious life without having heard also of the Association Meetings, a sort of great movable festival, annually held in Wales. At these annual gatherings twenty thousand people will sometimes come together; and by this immense congregation an eloquent preacher might be regarded as a "Sacred Bard."[1]

Wales has been for ages the land of bards; and these Association Meetings were a kind of religious Eisteddfodd, where the great Welsh preacher was a kind of sacred bard; he knew nothing of written

[1] Great Welsh preaching, says our author, is very often a kind of wild, irregular chant, a jubilant refrain, recurring again and again. The people catch the power of it: shouts arise—prayers! "*Bendigedig*" ("blessed"—"bless the Lord") Amen! "*Diolch byth!*" "*Gogoniad!*" (glory!) and other expressions rise and roll over the multitude.

sermons; he carried no notes nor writings with him to the pulpit or platform, but he made the law and doctrine of religious metaphysics march to the minstrelsy and music of speech. On the other hand, he did not indulge himself in casting about wildfire; all had been thoroughly prepared and rooted in his understanding; and then he went with his sermon, which was a kind of high song, to chant it over the hearts of the multitude.[1]

The hearts of the greatest preachers, however, had been prepared for their work by spiritual as well as by intellectual preparation. They were emphatically men of prayer; they preached "Christ crucified," with a yearning earnestness; they were "spiritually-minded;" and their pulpit or platform "power," as they well knew, was in the Presence of the Sovereign Spirit. An anecdote told of one of them, Gryffyth of Caernarvon, brings out this truth with a pleasing persuasiveness:—

Before preaching one night, staying at a farm-house on the spot, he desired permission to retire before the service began; he remained in his room a considerable time; the congregation had assembled, still he did not come; there was no sign of his making his appearance. The good man of the house sent the servant to request him to come, as the people had been for some time assembled and waiting. Approaching the room she heard what seemed to her to be a conversation going on between two persons in a subdued tone of voice, and she caught from Mr. Gryffyth the expression, "*I* will not go unless *you* come with me." She went back to her master, and said, "I do not think Mr. Gryffyth will come to-night; there is some one with him, and he is telling him that he will not come unless the other will come too; but I did not hear the other reply, so I think Mr. Gryffyth will not come to night." "Yes, yes," said the farmer, "*he* will come, and I warrant the *other* will come too, if matters are as you say between them; but we had better begin singing and reading until the *two* do come." And the story goes on to say that Mr. Gryffyth did come, and the other One with him, for they had a very extraordinary meeting that night, and the whole neighbourhood was stirred by it, and numbers were changed and converted.

Christmas Evans was born on Christmas Day—and hence his Christian name—in 1766. His father, a shoemaker, died when

---

[1] Some of the great preachers repeated the same sermon many times To Christmas Evans a pert young preacher said, "Well, you have given us an old sermon again to-day."

"What then, my boy," said the Master of Assemblies; "had you a new one?"

"Certainly," was the answer.

"Well, but look you," said the unblushing old culprit, "I would not take a dozen new sermons like yours for this one old sermon of mine."

"No, nor I," chimed in a gruff old deacon. "Oh yes, and look you, I should like it to hear it again; but as for *yours*, I never heard it before, and I do not want to hear it again."

he was a child; and for six miserable years Christmas stayed with an uncle, a cruel, selfish drunkard. At the age of seventeen he could not read a word. There is an erroneous impression that in the days of his youth he was a boxer, and that he lost his eye in a fight. The truth is, however, he lost his eye after his conversion; some of his former companions set on the young man, beat him unmercifully, and one struck him with a stick over the eye. In after years, when some one was jesting before Robert Hall at Welsh preachers, upon his mentioning Christmas Evans, the jester said, "And he has only one eye." "Yes, sir," answered Mr. Hall, "but that's a piercer; an eye that could light an army through a wilderness in a dark night."

When he was about seventeen years of age, at which time he became a member of a Church, almost Unitarian, but originally Presbyterian, he began in a humble way to read and study. After a time, he made an attempt at preaching; and his first sermon was taken from Beveridge's "Thesaurus Theologicus," borrowed probably from his pastor. Mr. Davies went home and found the sermon; but he said that he had still hopes "of the son of Samuel the shoemaker, because the prayer[1] was as good as the sermon." The spiritual life of the young man was deepening; he heard, from able preachers, evangelical expositions of Christian truth. Afterwards, his "convictions as to the meaning and importance of the rite of Baptism," became changed. When he was twenty years old he applied to the Baptist Church at Aberdare, where he was in due time received.

The early years of his ministerial life, it appears, were seasons of spiritual depression. A nervous imagination is sometimes very exhausting, and brings the physical frame very low. His ideas and ideals were exalted. Himself he deemed a mass of ignorance and sin. He thought by committing his sermons to memory he forfeited the gift of the Holy Spirit; and from one or other humiliating trouble he came to the conclusion that God would have nothing to do with him as a preacher. Nevertheless, though unconscious of the powers within him, Evans was feeling his way; and as he was learning in the school of submission he passed on to eminence and usefulness.

Lleyn, a hamlet near Caernarvon Bay, was the first place where he seems to have felt his feet. He was ordained as a missionary to work among the humble churches of that obscure district. A new life of faith began to glow in him; and a wondrous power attended his preaching. He tasted the first

[1] "Perhaps he would not have thought so hopefully of the young man had he then known," says Mr. Hood, "that the prayer, too, was very greatly committed to memory, from a collection of prayers by a well-known clergyman, Griffith Jones of Llanddrownor."

prelibations of a successful ministry; and the blessing was as a draught of pure old wine. The fame that a wonderful man of God had appeared, spread through South Wales on the wings of the wind. He went on a preaching tour through the more remote parts; and the news that Christmas Evans was to preach was sufficient to attract thousands. He frequently preached five times a Sunday and walked twenty miles. No wonder that such labour and incessant excitement told upon his health; it was even feared that he might sink into consumption. But he was not to remain long at Lleyn. At a certain Association Meeting, from a hitch in the arrangements, Mr. Evans was called upon to preach; he showed himself an orator; and the thousands carried home with them the memory of the "one-eyed lad." From that day he was one of the most famous preachers in the Principality.

In 1792, when twenty-six years of age, he left Lleyn.[1] He was summoned to serve the churches of his order in the Island of Anglesea; his stipend was seventeen pounds a year; and for the twenty years during which he performed this service he never asked for more. He went forth in an apostolic spirit; and like St. Paul, he had learnt "to be content."

"On his arrival in Anglesea," says Mr. Hood, "he found ten small Baptist Societies, lukewarm and faint; what amount of life there was in them was spent in the distraction of theological controversy, which just then appeared to rage, strong and high, among the Baptists in North Wales. He had not a brother minister to aid him within a hundred and fifty miles; but he commenced his labours in real earnest, and one of his first movements was to appoint a day of fasting and prayer in all the preaching places; he soon had the satisfaction to find a great revival; and it may with truth be said, 'the pleasure of the Lord prospered in his hand.'"

In this Anglesea village Evans passed his days in real Christian happiness; and to his great pulpit eminence and his simple daily life[2] have been applied, not unnaturally, the fine lines of Wordsworth:—

> So did he travel on life's common way
> In cheerful lowliness; and yet his heart
> The mightiest duties on itself did lay.

---

[1] While at Lleyn he married Catherine Jones, "a member of his own Church, a pious girl, and regarded as in every way suitable for his companion."

[2] His cottage seems to have been a very poor shanty or windy shieling: it stood on a bleak exposed piece of ground. A stable for the pony formed a part of it; the furniture was very poor and scanty; the one room served for living-room and study. Nevertheless, to apply to his student and preacher the words of Jean Paul Richter, "The pain of poverty was

One extract, at least, we must give from the sermons which he preached during this period. In a sermon on the demoniac of Gadara, after a brief and simple introduction, we read, the preacher broke loose from all relations of comment and explanation, and seemed to revel in dramatic scenery :—

"I imagine," he said, "that this demoniac was not only an object of pity, but he was really a terror to the country. So terrific was his appearance, so dreadful and hideous his screams, so formidable, frightful, and horrid his wild career, that all the women in that region were so much alarmed that none of them dared go to market, lest he should leap upon them like a panther on his prey.

"And what made him still more terrible was the place of his abode. It was not in a city, where some attention might be paid to order and decorum, though he would sometimes ramble into the city, as in this case. It was not in a town or village, or any house whatever, where assistance might be obtained in case of necessity; but it was among the tombs, and in the wilderness, not far, however, from the turnpike road. No one could tell but that he might leap at them, like a wild beast, and scare them to death. The gloominess of the place made it more awful and solemn. It was among the tombs, where, in the opinion of some, all witches, corpse-candles, and hobgoblins abide.

"One day, however, Mary was determined that no such nuisance should be suffered in the country of the Gadarenes. The man must be clothed, though he was mad and crazy. And if he should, at any future time, strip himself, tie up his clothes in a bundle, throw them into the river, and tell them to go to see Abraham, he must be tied and taken care of. Well, this was all right; no sooner said than done. But, so soon as the fellow was bound, although even in chains and fetters, Samson-like, he broke the bands asunder, and could not be tamed.

"By this time, the devil became offended with the Gadarenes, and, in a point, he took the demoniac away, and drove him into the wilderness. He thought the Gadarenes had no business to interfere and meddle with his property; for he had possession of the man. And he knew that 'a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.' It is probable that he wanted to send him home; for there was no knowing what might happen nowadays. But there was too much matter about him to send him as he was; therefore he thought the best plan would be to persuade him to commit suicide by cutting his throat. But here Satan was at a nonplus—his rope was too short. He could not turn executioner himself, as that would not have answered the design he has in view when he wants people to commit suicide; for the act would have been his own sin, and not the man's. The poor demoniac, therefore, must go about to hunt for a sharp stone, or anything that he could get. He might have been in search of such an article when he

---

to him only as the piercing of a maiden's ear, and jewels were hung in the wound." Mr. Hood fitly compares with him Felix Neff, and terms Evans the Pastor of our English Engadine.

returned from the wilderness into the city, whence he came, when he met the Son of God.

"Jesus commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. And when he saw Jesus, he cried out, and fell down before Him, and, with a loud voice, said, 'What have I to do with Thee, Jesus, Thou Son of God Most High? I beseech Thee, torment me not.' Here is the devil's confession of faith.

* * * * * * *

"Jesus commanded the legion of unclean spirits to come out of the man. They knew that out they must go. But they were like Irishmen—very unwilling to return to their own country. They would rather go into hogs' skins than to their own country. And he suffered them to go into the herd of swine. Methinks that one of the men who fed the hogs kept a better look out than the rest of them, and said, 'What ails the hogs? Look sharp there, boys—keep them in.' . . . .

"One of them said, 'They are all gone!'

"'No, sure not all gone into the sea!'

"'Yes, every one of them, the *black hog* and all. They are all drowned! the devil is in them. What shall we do now? What can we say to the owners?'"

The concluding portion of this sermon is very beautiful. There is a pathetic picture of the restored maniac's returning home, Mary embracing her husband, and the children crowding round with gladness and praise.[1]

When Christmas Evans was about sixty years old, clouds of trouble thickened around him. "It often seems that trouble, in the ministerial life," says Mr. Hood (in one of his many suggestive sentences), "comes exactly at the moment when life is least able to stand, with strength, against it." Certainly, in the life of Christmas Evans, sorrows multiplied at one time. In the year 1823 he lost the beloved companion of all the Anglesea life—his pious and devoted wife. The societies which he had formed grew restive and self-willed: burdens were laid upon him which he ought not to have been called upon to bear: there was injustice among the people, and ingratitude; moreover, he suffered from the jealousy of Ministers greatly inferior to him both in mind and character.

In the year 1826 he left Anglesea, and settled in the village of Caerphilly. Here his ministry, says Mr. Hood, was "gloriously successful." From all the inhabitants in the neighbour-

[1] In any account of Welsh preaching, it is well said, the place, the scenery, must not be forgotten. Christmas Evans preached some of his noblest sermons amidst ruins, or on the slope of a gorse-covered hill in the neighbourhood of tumbling torrents. In many ways, of course, Wales has changed since the great preaching period, 1730–1830.

hood he received marks of great respect; and he always after remembered this period of his life with gratitude.[1]

When sixty-seven years of age, Mr. Evans moved to Caernarvon. He was invited to take charge of a Church which consisted of about thirty members, chiefly of the lowest class; the chapel was £800 in debt. At a ministerial meeting in Cardiff, the question of Mr. Evans's returning to the North was being discussed, and the matter was virtually settled, when a young minister spoke up in the conference, and said to the venerable man, "Yes, you had better go to Caernarvon; it is not likely your talents would suit; but you might do excellently well at Caernarvon." This impudent speech astounded all the ministers present; but, after a pause, Mr. Evans opened his one large eye upon his adviser, and said, "Ay, where hast thou come from? How long is it since thou didst chip thy shell?" Some gentleman facilitated his return by giving him a gig, so that he might travel, with Mrs. Evans, at his ease, and in his own way. His horse, Jack, had been his companion for twenty years. The horse knew from a distance the tones of his master's voice; and the pair were very fond of one another. The old man bade farewell to Cardiff in the year 1832. As he was coming down the pulpit-stairs on a July Sunday evening, in the year 1838, he said: "*This is my last sermon!*" And so it was. That night he was taken very ill; and on Friday his fifty-three years of ministerial life were ended. He spoke of Christ crucified, repeated a verse from a favourite Welsh hymn, and then, as if he had done with earth he waved his hand, and exclaimed, "*Good-by! Drive on!*"

Art. IV.—CONTUMACIOUS CHRISTIANS AND LORD BEAUCHAMP'S BILL.

A BILL was introduced at the end of last Session into Parliament, avowedly for the purpose of getting the Rev. S. F. Green, of Miles Platting, out of the Lancaster gaol. With considerable alteration, introduced in the House of Lords, the Bill was sent down to the Commons, and was there counted out. We must expect, however, that the same Bill will be reintroduced into Parliament next session; and, inasmuch as it most nearly concerns the interests of the Established Church, it is highly desirable that good citizens should make themselves acquainted with the proposal in all its bearings. We print the Bill itself

[1] Mary Evans, the old and faithful servant of himself, and his departed wife, was summoned from Anglesea to Caerphilly; and he married her in the parish church in which George Whitefield was married.

in an appendix to this paper; and we would entreat our liberal and careful readers not to rest satisfied with the comments we make upon its various provisions, or the conclusions we may draw therefrom, but in every case to verify or disprove what we may say by referring to the language of the Bill itself.

The particular object of the Bill, so far as it is to be found elsewhere than by inference from its actual enactments, is expressed in the preamble—viz., that it is expedient to amend the Act of 3 and 4 Vict. c. 93: and this is followed up by repeating the first proviso of that Act. The whole of this Act is printed below,[1] showing in italics the proviso intended to be repealed.

It gave to the Ecclesiastical Court the power, which it had not before, of ordering the release of a party committed for contempt in disobeying an order, although obedience had not in fact been rendered. It enabled the Court to dispense with obedience, if the other party consented; or, in cases of refusal to pay church-rates of an amount less than £5, on mere payment of the costs incurred by reason of the contempt, and the sum sued for, although the other party refused his consent. This Act was passed in 1840. Since then compulsory church-rates have been abolished, and the second proviso of the Act has in consequence been superseded. The effect of the proposed repeal of the first proviso will be to enable the Court to dispense, not only with obedience on the part of the offender, but also with the consent of the other party. We do not think this proposal unreasonable in itself. It is right to enforce payment of debts, but it does not follow that we ought to allow creditors to imprison their

---

[1] 3 & 4 *Vict. c.* 93.

Whereas it is expedient to make further regulations for the release of persons committed to gaol under the writ De Contumace capiendo:

Be it enacted, &c.

That after the passing of this Act, it shall be lawful for the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, or the Judge of any Ecclesiastical Court, if it shall seem meet to the said Judicial Committee or Judge, to make an order upon the gaoler, sheriff, or other officer in whose custody any party is or may be hereafter, under any writ *de contumace capiendo* already issued or hereafter to be issued, in consequence of any proceedings before the said Judicial Committee or the Judge of the said Ecclesiastical Court, for discharging such party out of custody; and such sheriff, gaoler, or other officer, shall on receipt of the said order forthwith discharge such party:

Provided always that no such order shall be made by the said Judicial Committee or Judge without the consent of the other party or parties to the suit:

Provided always that in cases of subtraction of Church rates for an amount not exceeding £5, where the party in contempt has suffered imprisonment for six months and upwards, the consent of the other parties to the suit shall not be necessary to enable the Judge to discharge such party so soon as the costs lawfully incurred by reason of the custody and contempt of such party shall have been discharged, and the sum for

debtors until payment. It is enough if the results of non-payment are sufficiently disagreeable to induce debtors, *as a rule*, to pay. There will always be a Mr. Pickwick here and there who won't pay, whatever you do to him. On the other hand, though we do not imprison for debt, we give the creditor every facility for obtaining payment out of his debtor's property, through the medium of writs of execution and the Bankruptcy Courts. There is nothing to complain of if the enforcement of ecclesiastical duties is judiciously treated on the same principles. And thus we come to the consideration of what Lord Beauchamp proposes to do.

He proposes to substitute in certain cases deprivation of the benefice for imprisonment, presumably because he considers deprivation the more satisfactory punishment; and so far we agree with him, where the party has a benefice of which he can be deprived; but why, then, does not Lord Beauchamp go further, and give the judge power himself to substitute deprivation for imprisonment without the necessity of waiting till the man has been six months in prison? As the Bill is drawn the recalcitrant *must* be confined for six months certain; but if deprivation is better than imprisonment, why should the man lie six months in prison? Why not substitute at once the better punishment and give the Court power to shorten the term of imprisonment by depriving the offender at an earlier period than the end of the six months? When a man has been in prison a week it is certain that he does not intend to conform,

---

which he may have been cited into the Ecclesiastical Court shall have been paid into the registry of the said Court, there to abide the result of the suit; and the party so discharged shall be released from all further observance of justice in the said suit.

2. And be it enacted that any such order may be in the form given in the schedule annexed to this Act.

3. And be it enacted that this Act may be amended or repealed by any Act to be passed in this Session of Parliament.

SCHEDULE.

Warrant of Discharge.

To the Sheriff [Gaoler or Keeper, as the case may be] of in the county of .

Forasmuch as good cause hath been shown to us [or me] [here insert the description of the Judicial Committee, or Judge, as the case may he] wherefore A. B. of , now in your custody, as it is said, under a writ de Contumace Capiendo, issued out of [here insert the description of the Court out of which the writ issued] in a suit in which [here insert the description of the parties to the suit] should be discharged from custody under the said writ; we [or, I] therefore with the consent of the said [here insert the description of the parties consenting] command you, on behalf of our Sovereign Lady the Queen, that if the said A. B. do remain in your custody for the said cause and no other, you forbear to detain him [or, her] any longer, but that you deliver him [or, her] thence, and suffer him [or, her] to go at large, for which this shall be your sufficient warrant. Given, &c.

and it is by far the most merciful course, and at the same time the least scandalous and the most satisfactory to everybody, to cut short both the agony and the resistance of the recusant.

With this view we offer the draft of three sections which might be introduced by way of amendment in Lord Beauchamp's Bill after the first section:—

It shall be lawful for the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, or the Judge of any Ecclesiastical Court, if it shall seem meet to the said Judicial Committee or Judge, upon making any such order as is mentioned in the first section of the said Act, to pronounce or inflict upon the person to whom such order relates a sentence of deprivation.

Such sentence of deprivation need not purport to be pronounced or inflicted by virtue of this Act; and shall not be invalidated by any invalidity or irregularity in, or relating to, the warrant of discharge by which such party shall be released from prison, or in, or relating to, any writ *de contumace capiendo* by the apparent authority of which such party shall have been imprisoned, or in, or relating to, any writ in consequence of which such writ *de contumace capiendo* shall have issued.

A warrant of discharge issued without any consent of parties may omit the words relating to the consent of parties contained in the form in the schedule to the said Act.[1]

The result of these amendments would be not to abolish imprisonment for contumacy—and in this respect they agree with Lord Beauchamp's Bill—but to shorten the period of six months' imprisonment now standing in Lord Beauchamp's Bill by enabling the Court to deprive as soon as ever it appears that imprisonment will not serve its purpose. We cannot see the sense of imprisoning the man at all, except for the purpose of inducing him to obey the law; and when it is clear that imprisonment will not effect this object, the less we have of it the better.

But some one will doubtless say, Your arguments are all very well, provided it is admitted that the only object of imprisonment is to make the punished person obey the law; but that is not the case; punishment is needed not only to correct the punished person, but also to deter others from offending; and indeed in some cases, in the case of capital punishments for instance, to deter others is necessarily the only object.

Such an objector has forgotten that what he says is only

---

[1] Lord Beauchamp's Bill omits to make this necessary alteration in the form of the warrant of discharge, from which it might be inferred that the contemptuous party's consent was to be essential if the other party's consent were refused, and that the Court could not act *mero motu*. But we presume that he did not intend to force his friends to anything so repugnant to their consciences as to consent to their own release.

applicable to punishments properly so called—definite punishments inflicted for definite offences—and not to the mere means of enforcing obedience to the orders of the Court. The means of enforcing obedience are something totally distinct from the punishment of offences. The punishment of offences pertains to the criminal courts and criminal jurisdiction alone; but to have the means of enforcing its orders on the parties or on others in the course of litigation, is essential to every court of law whatever. The orders which require enforcement may be made not only at the end of the proceedings, but also at any time during their progress. They may be, and are, in fact, made upon plaintiffs and defendants indiscriminately; nay, even upon persons who are not parties to the proceedings or in any way interested therein; as, for example, upon a mere witness, or a juryman. In short, wherever in the course of legal proceedings somebody, whether a litigant party or not, ought to do something which is necessary to be done, in order to do justice between the two litigant parties, the order enjoining him to do it, must, in the interest of justice, be made enforceable in some way or other. And the object of imposing disagreeable consequences upon disobedience to these orders is solely to enforce obedience by the person to whom they are addressed.

Now, the imprisonment under the writ *de contumace capiendo* is solely with a view to enforce obedience to the orders of an Ecclesiastical Court by the person to whom the orders were addressed. These orders *may* be addressed to the defendant—the orders we are all thinking of were no doubt so addressed—but they *may* be addressed to the plaintiff, or even to persons not concerned in the result of the suit in which the orders are made. And whatever disagreeable consequences may ensue from disregarding them, those consequences have only a superficial resemblance to punishment inflicted for a criminal offence, which can only be inflicted on the defendant himself.

The punishments (properly so called) which can be inflicted by the Ecclesiastical Court are suspension, deprivation, and the like, and do not include imprisonment, which is a punishment as much outside the power of the Ecclesiastical Courts as it is outside those of the Court of Chancery, the Court of Admiralty, or the Divorce Court. Imagine the Divorce Court, in a suit for the restitution of conjugal rights, sentencing a man to six months' imprisonment! The thing is incongruous and absurd on the face of it; and yet if the order for restitution were wilfully disobeyed in the very smallest particular, the offender would be sent to prison without the slightest hesitation, and as a matter of course. He is not punished for not taking his wife back—he has perhaps obeyed to that extent—but for disobeying, and in order to force him to obey, the order of the Court. In the same

way, it is a simple mis-statement, and the result of dense ignorance or wilful confusion, to repeat, as the Ritualists repeat, that Mr. Green was sent to prison for wearing illegal vestments. He was imprisoned for disobeying the order of the Court. The order of the Court inhibited him from officiating at all; it would have been equally disobeyed, and would have equally rendered him liable to imprisonment, whether he had officiated in legal or illegal vestments.[1]

It is essential to bear these distinctions in mind, when the proposal is made to change the law under which Mr. Green and others have been imprisoned. It is one thing to change the law under which he was *sentenced*, and quite another thing to change the law under which he was *imprisoned*. Though the Public Worship Act and the Clergy Discipline Act should both be wiped out of the Statute Book to-morrow, yet the scandal (if it be a scandal) would remain—that clergymen are liable, like everybody else, to be imprisoned through refusing to act against their consciences, where their consciences are in conflict with their legally ascertained duties. True it is that, by abrogating some of these duties, some occasions would be removed on which it is possible for their consciences to be in conflict with the performance of them. But so long as they have any irksome duties as clergymen or otherwise, the possibility of imprisonment, and therefore the scandal of such a possibility, will remain.

Lord Beauchamp does not, in so many words, propose to alter the duties of Mr. Green, or of any other clergyman. He does not propose to alter the punishments inflicted by law for neglect of those duties. All that he leaves as it is.

The Bill deals, in fact, only with the *execution* of sentences and orders. We contend that this is a totally wrong principle. Take the severity out of your sentences to as great an extent as is consistent with the public weal: but don't while leaving your sentences hard, render their execution weak and futile. It is as if some philanthropist were to say, "I do not propose to make murder lawful; I do not propose even to change the sentence of death now pronounced on the murderer; but when the man has fallen a certain distance through the air, I think he has fallen far enough, the scandal ought to cease, and I propose that at that point the rope round his neck ought to break, and the poor misguided man to meet *terra firma* once more."[2]

---

[1] No doubt, if he had never worn a chasuble, he would not have gone to prison. Neither would Mr. Pickwick, if he had never lodged at Mrs. Bardell's; but it is not recorded that Mr. Pickwick ever protested against the monstrous injustice, the tyrannous persecution, of being sent to prison for lodging at Mrs. Bardell's, or even for ordering chops and tomato sauce.

[2] To make the parallel quite exact, our philanthropist should continue:—

There is this great advantage in maintaining imprisonment as the means of enforcing obedience to judicial orders, that it is universally applicable to all alike, high and low, rich and poor, lay and clerical. You cannot reach the poorest with a fine; the richest will not mind it, unless you can graduate its amount according to the income of the offender; and if an inquiry into his income has to be entered upon, the remedy loses the promptness which constitutes a large part of its efficacy. It is therefore only the middle classes with whom a fine could be a prompt and effectual method. And it is also unnecessarily cruel, for there can be no restitution on obedience being rendered. For if there were restitution of the fine on obedience being rendered, the method of fining would of course lose its efficacy. There used once to be the method of outlawry, the principle of which was that where a man would not do his duty to the State, the State simply placed him outside of its protection. This method might in some cases be very efficacious, but it is not sufficiently prompt; and its persuasive power would vary according to the number and strength of the ties by which the offender was connected with the social fabric of the country. A foreigner merely residing temporarily in this country, would care no more for outlawry than a ritualist cares for suspension. But imprisonment of the person is a method which if open at all to these objections, is so only in a very much smaller degree than any other available method. It is prompt; it is the same to all persons alike; it proportions itself in respect of length to the obstinacy of the party; it can be readily remitted; it leaves no irremediable consequences; and it has been very generally effectual. Consequently a proposal to substitute something else will require very strong support. And when there is no reason why the new method should not exist concurrently with the old, and prove its superiority if it can in fair competition, it is unwisdom, surely, to throw away our already tried weapon, before we have proved the new one? Why not let both stand together in our armoury?

So much for the general principle of this Bill. Let us now examine its provisions more in detail. In cases where the contumacious person, having been let out of prison after his six months' internment by virtue of Lord Beauchamp's Bill, persists in his illegalities, and the Bishop certifies his continued disobedience, how does Lord Beauchamp propose to deal with him?

"But the poor man shall not by reason of the safety of his neck in manner aforesaid, be released from further execution of his sentence; provided that he shall not be hanged again, in manner aforesaid, except for costs, unless," &c. &c. &c.

The Court shall issue against such party or person, being an incumbent within the meaning of the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, for the purpose of enforcing obedience to the monitions or monition, orders or order, previously made and disobeyed in such suit, an inhibition, which shall have the same force and effect in all respects as if the same had been a second inhibition issued within three years from the relaxation of an inhibition under the thirteenth section of the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874.

This roundabout and referential language can, in our opinion, lead to nothing but most unnecessary doubt and difficulty in interpreting the law. But let us see what it really comes to.

The Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, sec. 13, says that upon a second inhibition being issued within the three years after the relaxation of a former inhibition in regard to the same monition, "any benefice or other ecclesiastical preferment held by the incumbent of the parish in which the church or burial-ground is situate . . . . in relation to which church or burial-ground such monition has been issued, shall become void," unless the bishop postpone it. He is not deprived of *all* his preferments within the jurisdiction, as would be the case upon an ordinary sentence of deprivation; but only of the particular one. If the offender is unfit to keep one benefice, one would conclude that he was unfit to keep any. This is the whole theory of deprivation in such cases. It is exactly like cashiering. His services are dispensed with, and that is all. The deprivation, if proper at all, ought to be general, not partial.

But does this verbiage really mean deprivation at all? We are not prepared to say for certain that the language of the Bill does not amount to saying that the Court shall inflict a sentence of (at all events, partial) deprivation; but if that is the intention, why not plainly say so? The very fact that it would have been so easy to say so affords a valid argument against such an intention; but what then can be meant?

Looking closer into it, we shall perceive that the Public Worship Regulation Act only takes away (the language is quoted above) "any benefice or other ecclesiastical preferment held by the incumbent in the parish in which the church or burial-ground is situate . . . . in relation to which . . . . *such* monition has been issued." *Such* monition is a monition upon a representation; where there has been no representation, there can be no *such* monition, and therefore no church or burial-ground to which *such* monition can relate; therefore none to become void. Is this an intentional loophole?

We can easily imagine an enormous crop of wasteful litigation springing out of this absurdly involved phraseology. We do not yet know what is the effect of a second inhibition under the Public Worship Regulation Act. We do indeed know what the

Public Worship Regulation Act says shall be the effect; but we cannot know what holes may be picked in that part of the Act until it comes to be disputed in some case arising upon it. It is mere reckless folly at present to say that an inhibition under Lord Beauchamp's Bill shall have the effect of a second inhibition under the Public Worship Regulation Act.

The careful reader will have observed that the Bill says "the Court *shall* issue" the inhibition. This takes away the Court's discretion in the matter. The Court becomes merely the minister of the Bishop. Upon the Bishop's certificate of nonconformity, no other question will be allowed to be mooted—no other evidence will be required or admitted. Why, then, should the bishop not act alone, or even his certificate alone suffice?

There are, indeed, cases which Lord Beauchamp (or his draftsman, or both) have entirely forgotten, in which deprivation is clearly no substitute for imprisonment. Supposing the offender has no benefice, what is to happen?

Where indeed the contemptuous party has a benefice, he loses it; at least that seems to be the general effect of this wordy section; but what besides? He is, *ex hypothesi*, under an inhibition—that is, in intelligible language, a prohibition, injunction, or order not to do something. Not to do what? Amusing as it seems, Lord Beauchamp leaves this to the fancy of the reader. But it does not much matter, because whatever the inhibition may order, Lord Beauchamp prescribes what its *effect* is to be. "It shall have the same force and effect in all respects, as if it had been a second inhibition issued within three years from the relaxation of an inhibition under the thirteenth section of the Public Worship Act, 1874." Now, the inhibition referred to forbids the party from officiating anywhere in the diocese; consequently we presume that Lord Beauchamp's inhibitions are to forbid (we beg pardon, to have the force and effect of forbidding) the party to officiate anywhere within the diocese. This may be the difference between a person simply deprived by a sentence of deprivation, and a person deprived by the effect of an inhibition under Lord Beauchamp's Bill, that the latter is not only deprived, but is also prohibited, from officiating within the diocese. Now, in what is the advantage of this addition, especially when the only practical means of enforcing it are expressly abolished?[1]

[1] If Lord Beauchamp really intends that the "means of enforcing" are to be deprivation only, he leaves monitions to unbeneficed clergymen and laymen totally unprovided with any means of enforcement whatever: while, on the other hand, if he thinks that his inhibitions will have any effect beyond deprivation, that effect is only that the man, having been ordered (monished) to do something, and having disobeyed that order so obstinately that he has deliberately preferred six months' imprisonment to obedience, is to be ordered to do something else (inhibited): and there

One thing more on this part of the Bill. It provides that "in any case in which such inhibition shall have been issued, no further signification of any sentence of contumacy or contempt shall be made against the same party or person with a view to the issuing of a writ *de contumace capiendo* under [the Statutes on that behalf]—unless such party or person shall attempt to officiate or otherwise act as incumbent of 'the benefice of which he has been deprived.'" Lord Beauchamp cannot have had the slightest idea of what he was doing. In no suit then existing, in no suit thereafter to be instituted, whether against himself or by himself, or by or against anybody else, whatever his conduct may be, contempt in open court or in anything incidental to the administration of justice, whether he is beneficed or unbeneficed, lay or clerical, litigant or not, can that fortunate person ever be "signified" again, unless he happens to be a beneficed clergyman and to have attempted to officiate or otherwise act as incumbent of a benefice of which he has been *deprived under Lord Beauchamp's bill.*[1] He has been, as it were, inoculated with a mild dose of imprisonment, and need not fear that it will ever touch him again, unless he officiates or *otherwise* acts as incumbent of the benefice of which he has been so deprived.[2]

After all, we doubt whether it is possible by any amendments to convert Lord Beauchamp's Bill into a workable measure. It would be better to begin *de novo*. The Church Association are said to have a Bill in hand for a similar object. If so, they will be adding one more to the many services they have rendered to the Church. They have at least competent knowledge of the subject at their command. We hope the rumour may prove correct; and that by their assistance, and the concurrence of moderate men of all parties, a really good Bill may be passed; in which Justice shall be tempered with Mercy, and (what we think of far greater importance) both Justice and Mercy shall be bridled by common-sense.

A LAWYER.

APPENDIX.

Whereas it is expedient to amend the Act of Parliament of the third and fourth years of the reign of Queen Victoria, chapter ninety-three:

Be it enacted, &c.

1. The second proviso in the said Act is hereby repealed.

---

are no means, when deprivation has taken place, of enforcing either order. The "means of enforcing," then, are mere windy scolding, so far (if at all) as they extend beyond simple deprivation.

[1] The reader will perceive, on carefully perusing the language of the Bill, that no other deprivation will bar the party from his immunity.

[2] Even the exception is ambiguously worded. It *may* be, and ought to be, equivalent to "unless he attempts to act as incumbent of the benefice

2. Any party or person committed to gaol under the writ *de contumace capiendo* shall, at the expiration of six months from the time when he was first so committed to gaol, if he be still in custody, be discharged out of custody by the sheriff, gaoler, or other officer in whose custody he may be without any order.

3. Such party or person shall, notwithstanding his discharge, remain liable for the costs lawfully incurred by reason of his custody and contempt.

4. Such party or person shall not by reason of his discharge in manner aforesaid be released from further observance of justice in the suit in which he has been pronounced in contempt: Provided always, that no further proceeding shall be taken in such suit except as to costs unless the bishop of the diocese certify in writing under his hand that the party or person has since his release from custody had an opportunity of submitting to his admonition and has failed to submit to the same. And upon such certificate being filed in the registry of the Court in which such suit shall be depending (whether the same shall have been instituted under the Act for better enforcing Church Discipline passed in the fourth year of Her present Majesty, or under the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874) the said Court shall issue against such party or person, being an incumbent within the meaning of the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, for the purpose of enforcing obedience to the monitions or monition, orders or order, previously made and disobeyed in such suit, an inhibition, which shall have the same force and effect in all respects as if the same had been a second inhibition issued within three years from the relaxation of an inhibition under the thirteenth section of the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874; and from and after the time when such inhibition shall have been duly served upon such party or person, or after the expiration of the time (if any) during which the effect of such inhibition may have been postponed by the bishop, pursuant to the power in that behalf given to him by the said thirteenth section of the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, every such benefice or other ecclesiastical preferment held by such party or person as is mentioned in the thirteenth section of the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, shall become void in the same manner and with the same effects and consequences in all respects as if such inhibition had been a second inhibition duly issued under and by virtue of the thirteenth section of the last-mentioned Act: Provided also, that in any case in which such inhibition shall have been issued, no further signification of any sentence of contumacy or contempt shall be made against the same party or person with a view to the issuing of a writ *de contumace capiendo* under the provisions of the Act passed in the fifty-third year of King George the Third, intituled "An Act for the better Regulation of Ecclesiastical Courts in England, and for the more easy recovery of Church Rates and Tithes," or of any Act amending the same, unless such party or person shall attempt to officiate or otherwise act as incumbent of such benefice or other ecclesiastical preferment, after the same shall have become void as aforesaid.

5. This Act may be cited as the Discharge of Contumacious Prisoners Act, 1881.

[of which he has been deprived] or officiates." But, as it stands, it may also mean "unless he officiates as incumbent of the Church of which he has been deprived," leaving him free to officiate elsewhere, and even to officiate in his old church otherwise than as incumbent.

Art. V.—EVENING COMMUNION.

THE practice of administering the Holy Communion in the evening is now becoming more and more general every year in all our large towns and thickly populated parishes. In London, for instance, which we may take as the centre of Church life, as it is of population, there were in the year 1879, according to Mackeson's "Guide," 262 churches in which there is Evening Communion, for 65 in which it was the practice in the year 1869. Thus, in the metropolis alone, within ten years, there has been an increase of about 200 churches where the practice is observed. We can only regard it as an outcome of the great revival of religious life which has gradually been going forward in the Church of England. Many of the most devoted of our parochial clergy find, as they struggle on to bring the ministrations of the Church home to the masses, that with numbers, who in days gone by would have been altogether neglected, the only hope of leading them to the Holy Communion is to have it at the later hour. But the great question is, whether they are doing right or wrong in thus administering in the evening?—whether it is to be regarded as a serious innovation, or only as a return of the Church to the original institution and practice required by the circumstances of the times? To this question we desire to have a clear and decided answer. We are satisfied that, with those who have adopted the Evening Communion, it will be found there is no attempt at will-worship, or disobedience to lawful authority, but simply a desire to bring the masses of our people into the full communion of the Church. We are not aware that in any case has the practice been authoritatively forbidden. But, while some have written against it and sought to discourage it, others have denounced it in such extraordinary language that we feel it to be of the highest importance to satisfy the minds of Churchmen on the subject. We propose, therefore, to inquire, as far as the limits of this article will allow, what we may gather from the teaching of Holy Scripture; what light is thrown upon it from the practice of the Church in the first four centuries; and what we may fairly take to be the rule of the Church of England as laid down in the Book of Common Prayer.

Before, however, we proceed to an examination of these points, it may be well to consider what has been laid down as to the practice of Evening Communion, by members of the Episcopal Bench, and those whose opinions would have weight in the Church. We are not aware that the attention of Convocation has been specially directed to the subject, or that any

suggestion has been made by that important body for the guidance of our Church. Some few of the prelates, however, have expressed themselves more or less strongly. In a Charge delivered in 1860, the late Bishop Wilberforce is the first to raise any grave objection to the practice. He thus sums up the grounds of his objection :—

That it is contrary to the usage of the whole Church, certainly from very early, and *most probably from Apostolic times ; that it involves an unlawful use of our Liturgy ;* and that *it directly tends to the desecration of the highest rite* of our holy religion.

We wish that our space permitted us to give the passage in full, if only to show the superficial manner in which it is sought to establish these points. But his Lordship goes so far as to say :—

This question being one of the legal construction of our offices, I have thought it my duty to consult the very learned Chancellor of our Diocese, and I am fortified by his opinion that any clergyman violating herein the monition of his bishop would subject himself to the penalty of suspension.

Again, in his Charge of 1866, he warns his clergy solemnly against Evening Communion. He says :—

That he believes such a celebration is contrary to the law of our Church, and that he feels himself bound to enforce obedience to that law, and to resist, by all means in his power, the introduction of this greatest of innovations.

None have spoken so strongly as this against the practice of Evening Communion. Bishop Wilberforce distinctly pronounces it to be illegal, tending to desecration, and bringing upon the clergy the penalty of suspension. But, of course, if this were really the case, it would be the bounden duty of the bishops to stop it.

The Bishop of Ely, at his primary visitation in 1877, thus expresses himself on the subject :—

I have been asked by several clergymen my opinion as to afternoon and evening communions. I have had but one answer, when consulted on the point—viz., that I shall deeply regret to see the practice increase. I recognize fully the love of souls which has led many to adopt it, under the hope of winning to the table of the Lord some who might never otherwise approach it. But my own experience does not allow me to admit the impossibility of any class of persons attending an early or midday celebration, if they have indeed an earnest desire to communicate ; and I do not think that the divesting attendance of all necessity for exertion and self-denial is in itself desirable ; or that it can be a sufficient ground for varying by our own individual will, from the usage through many centuries of the universal Church. Moreover, neither in our towns or villages are the surroundings of an

evening service such as to conduce to that quiet thoughtfulness and sustained seriousness which should both precede and follow the act of receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. On these grounds, and also because I observe distinct signs of the practice ceasing to be a right-minded effort to facilitate the access of certain classes to the Holy Communion, and *becoming a badge of party*, I am unable to give my approval to it. I must needs deprecate the introduction of yet another controversy amongst us, and that in connection with what should be, above all things, a witness and bond of unity.

But why should Evening Communion be considered the badge of a party any more than the early celebration? Both, if it comes to that, are a variation from the old-established usage of midday Communion in the Church of England; but both are regarded as showing an increasing desire on the part of the clergy to meet the altered circumstances of our times, and to give an opportunity to all classes to enter into the full communion of our Church. Why it need be a matter of controversy we are at a loss to understand. If a clergyman finds that he is able to meet the wants of a large number of his parishioners by having Communion in the evening, why should his brother clergymen find fault with him, and often in most unbrotherly language, because it may suit his own views, or the circumstances of his parish, to have it at the earlier hour? For our own part, we regard the time of Communion as of little importance compared with the frequency and reverence of administration. It has certainly been our experience in large towns that, with servants, artisans, and others of the labouring class, the evening hour was the most convenient; in fact, that in many cases it was impossible for them to attend at any other time. And this is confirmed by the census which has recently been made of Church attendance in Liverpool, Bristol, Wolverhampton, and other great centres of population, from which it appears that the numbers attending the Evening Service are greatly in excess of those who go to church in the morning. It is needless to inquire into the causes of this. We have only to deal with the fact. And shall we be fulfilling our duty to these people, or can we hope that the Church will gain a hold upon the masses of the population, if she refuses to give them the Holy Communion at the very time when the sacred ordinance was instituted by Christ Himself, and when they find it most convenient to attend? We cannot say what may be the surroundings of an Evening Service in the Diocese of Ely; but we have always considered that the calm and quiet of the day's close were most conducive to thoughtfulness and sustained seriousness.

> "It happened on a solemn eventide,
> Soon after He that was our Surety died,

Two bosom friends, each pensively inclined,
The scene of all those sorrows left behind,
Sought their own village, busied as they went
In musings worthy of the great Event;
They spake of Him they loved, of Him whose life,
Though blameless, had incurred perpetual strife;
Whose deeds had left, in spite of hostile arts,
A deep Memorial graven on their hearts.

* * * * *

The new acquaintance soon became a guest,
And made so welcome at their simple feast;
He blessed the bread, but vanished at the word,
And left them both exclaiming, 'Twas the Lord!
Did not our hearts feel all he deigned to say?
Did they not burn within us by the way?"

Thus it was in days gone by, and thus we believe it is with most of us still.

The Bishop of Chichester, in his Charge delivered at the Visitation of 1878, makes brief but decided mention of the subject:—

Early Communions [his Lordship says] for the benefit of those who cannot attend the Mid-day Service are greatly to be commended.

Evening Communions [however, he adds] are a novel introduction: discountenanced by the uniform practice of the Church; repugnant, as I think, also to the general feeling of the more pious and devout of our people, and open to many serious objections.

What those objections are the Bishop does not state; but we would appeal to our readers who are at all acquainted with Brighton, the largest centre in the Diocese of Chichester, as to which of the churches there have been most successful in supplying recruits to apostate Rome—whether those who are most diligent in early celebrations, or those who allow the people the privilege of an Evening Communion? We consider that this would be the best mode, perhaps, of ascertaining "the general feeling of the more pious and devout of our people."

The Bishop of Lichfield, in his Primary Charge, 1879–80, is one of the latest who have expressed their opinion to the clergy on the subject of Evening Communion, and, as he gives some very strong reasons for objecting to the practice, we quote the passage at length. His Lordship says:—

I am glad to find that in a large number of cases there are celebrations at an early hour of the day; I observe with less satisfaction the prevalence, especially in large towns, of Evening Communions. I am by no means prepared to speak of this arrangement in the strong terms of condemnation which are sometimes employed with respect to it, but nevertheless I deeply regret it. I do not indeed regard it as in itself inherently wrong. *That which was, for however short a time*

tolerated in Apostolic days, cannot have in it the nature of sin; but, on the other hand, I certainly feel that it is contrary to the mind of the Church, guided as we profess to believe by the promised help of the Holy Spirit. The practices of primitive days were in many instances necessary or permissible, under the exceptional circumstances of a time when the Church had only imperfectly developed its discipline and its order, but in all later times the custom of Evening Communion has been almost universally unknown. *We may well believe that just as the observance of the Jewish Sabbath continued for a considerable time after the foundation of the Christian Church, but gradually gave place to the festival of the Lord's Day; so the evening Communion,* instituted though it was at the time of the evening meal connected with the Passover, was gradually abandoned for *the early celebration, of which mention is made by more than one writer within the first century after the day of Pentecost.* Further, *it can scarcely be denied that in the history of the Reformed Church of England such a practice has been unknown until within recent days.* I am aware of the argument that is often used on behalf of the late hour, that it is impossible for certain classes of our parishioners to come either at midday or in the morning; but my own experience as a parish priest leads me to believe that this is not so. I have known an evening Communion discontinued, with the substitution of sufficiently early hours on the Sunday morning, and the addition of a forenoon service on one of the other days of the week, without the loss, so far as I could ascertain after careful inquiry, of a single communicant who had formerly attended the evening service. I believe that a similar result would follow if the same course were adopted in other parishes, and I earnestly trust that the experiment may be tried. I would only add that to leave to the closing hours of the Lord's Day, after all its necessary demands upon the spiritual powers of the worshippers, that special and only service the observance of which is commanded by our blessed Lord Himself, seems to me likely to foster, even if it does not indicate, a somewhat imperfect and languid condition of spiritual life, the very reverse of that which is likely to be quickened and sustained by the dedication of the earliest hours of the day to "these holy mysteries."

We have ourselves placed certain portions of this statement in italics, as calling for remark. The Bishop, we notice, omits to mention, perhaps as too well known, the fact that Christ instituted the Lord's Supper in the evening. But does he really wish us to believe that the example of our Lord in the original institution was only for a short time *tolerated* in Apostolic times, and that it was given up afterwards as contrary to the mind of the Church guided by the Holy Spirit? This is what his Lordship's words convey, and if we apprehend his meaning aright it is certainly startling. What he says about some of the practices of primitive days may be the case; but it is certainly not true in reference to the institution of the Lord's Supper. That bears no analogy whatever to the institution of the Lord's

Day, as superseding the Jewish Sabbath. The time, the facts, and all the circumstances of the one have been plainly recorded in the Inspired Volume, together with the express command of our blessed Lord attached to it; but of the other we are told nothing more than that it became an observance in the Church from the Resurrection day. We are at a loss to know who the writers can be within the first century after the day of Pentacost who mention the abandonment of the Evening Communion for the earlier celebration. If his Lordship alludes to the well-known letter of Pliny, the heathen writer, perhaps he will explain the passage; but he must do so from a heathen, not a theological point of view. We are not aware that any Christian writer before Tertullian, not even Justin Martyr, who goes into all the details of Holy Communion, makes mention of an early celebration. And as to the practice being unknown until recent days in the history of the Reformed Church of England, no sensible person would think of denying the fact, as it is only within recent days that there has been Evening Service at all in the Church of England, as we have it now. Morning and Afternoon Services were the general, if not the universal, practice. But what is more to the point, and it can scarcely be denied, is, that in the history of the Reformed Church of England, such a practice as early celebrations at 5.30, 6.30, 7.30, and 8 A.M. has been unknown until within recent days.

These, we believe, are the only, or at all events the most important, statements of our Bishops against the practice of Evening Communions. We have been careful to quote them, as far as possible, at length, and to call attention to every argument adduced, in order that nothing of their force and authority should be lost. But it remains for us to quote the weighty opinion of one other Prelate upon this subject, a Bishop whose premature loss the Church of England cannot cease to lament. Dr. Jeune, the late Bishop of Peterborough, was only spared to deliver one Charge; but in that valuable address his Lordship thus refers to Evening Communions:—

> Our Church has not limited the celebration of the Holy Communion to any special hour of the day. The ordinary time of administration is at the close of the first hour of evening. But at any time of the day or night we are authorized to transport the Church to the bedside, and there to commemorate and to communicate to a departing or languishing brother the benefits of the precious death of Christ. In some of our churches early Communions have been adopted with great advantage, and without any idea of thus gradually bringing in what is called Low Mass in the Romish Church. In one church, where the Holy Communion is administered at three different hours on successive Sundays, the alms at the several services have varied in the proportion of six, four, and two; a fact showing how well the arrangement

suits different classes of the faithful. In some cases the Eucharist has been administered in the evening of the day of confirmation to all, or all but a few, of the catachumens from the parish. Results however beneficial would, of course, not tempt a worthy pastor to introduce, or the Bishop to sanction, the use of the liberty allowed by our Church, if Scriptural, or even reasonable, objections against its use could be made good. But warrant ample there surely is for Evening Communion in the institution of His Supper by the Lord, and in the practice of Apostolic and after-times. "While they were eating, He took the bread, and, after supper, He took the cup." Surely our Church does well when she bids us in "these matters to cleave to the first beginning, hold fast the Lord's tradition, do that in the Lord's commemoration which He Himself did, He Himself commanded, and His Apostles confirmed." The rule seems eminently safe; yet what a havoc of error and superstitions would it make, if observed! Even as to the circumstances of place and time, in themselves indifferent, it is from those who vary from His institution, not from those who accord with it, that apology is due. But I have heard it said that the administration of the Eucharist in the evening by the Lord Himself is not an example to be followed; that it is a mere exception, in no case to be a precedent. This is bold; but I read something bolder still. I read that Evening Communions are a profanation. If so, the reproach cast upon them falls on Christ and His Apostles; for His Apostles, too, broke the bread at the evening meal: or rather it shows that in the minds of those who utter it, there are theories which were not in the minds of our Lord or His Apostles.

We should have been content with these quotations from Episcopal Charges as fully stating all that could be said upon the subject by those in authority. But it may be as well to add, for the further satisfaction of our readers, what has been written by others in the Church whose opinion may have weight. We shall mention two. The late Canon Ashwell, a few years ago, in a pamphlet dedicated to the Lord Bishop of Chichester, put forward all the arguments to be advanced against Evening Communion. The Dean of Norwich has also made reference to the subject, in the appendix to a recent edition of his valuable book on the Communion Office. The former of these writings, which is hardly worthy of a theologian of Canon Ashwell's standing, has, we believe, been fully answered in another pamphlet of much ability by the Rev. A. C. Pittar, formerly Vicar of Ashton Hayes, Chester. The Canon commences by assuming that the only two grounds for the practice of Evening Communion are to be found in the argument of expediency, and the example of our Lord in the original institution. He then proceeds to give, according to his own views, the authority of Scripture and the early Church as against the practice; and concludes with what he calls "moral and religious objections" to the Church in the nineteenth century doing exactly what her

Lord and Master did at the earliest Communion. We thus briefly allude to Canon Ashwell's pamphlet, as we hope later on to deal with his authorities and arguments under the heads which we proposed at the outset. Dr. Goulbourn's remarks, however, require to be given *in extenso*. He states the case with perfect fairness; and, while he does not hesitate to say that "he has a strong instinct against them, which can hardly be justified on grounds of reason," he frankly admits that "no exception whatever can be taken against Evening Communions, either from the Holy Scriptures, or from the Book of Common Prayer, or from the Constitutions and Canons of the Church of England." The passage is as follows:—

It is somewhat noticeable that at the very time when some ecclesiastics in our Church are seeking to re-establish fasting Communion and insisting upon its observance, others of an opposite school are introducing into their churches evening celebrations, not indeed as at all essential or obligatory, but as the only way, in their view, of providing opportunities of communicating for certain classes whose engagements do not admit of attendance in the forenoon. Perhaps this is one of the numerous instances of which one extreme of sentiment and practice in the Church begets another—in which the pendulum of thought, having swung in one direction, not only comes back again to the perpendicular position, but swings equally far in the direction opposite. I must be doubly cautious what I say on this subject of Evening Communions, as having personally and for myself a strong instinct against them, which can hardly, I fear, be justified on grounds of reason. It must be admitted that no exception whatever can be taken against Evening Communion, either from the Holy Scriptures, or from the Book of Common Prayer, or from the Constitutions and Canons of the Church of England. Nothing, as I believe, can be alleged against them but a very ancient and prevailing custom of the Church, such as is quoted in favour of fasting Communion, worthy of respect, no doubt, as being very ancient and prevailing, but by no means to be erected into a law of conscience, and capable in its very nature of modification or alteration to meet new circumstances of the Church and new phases of society. And if I personally happen to feel (as I do, and many with me) that for myself Communion late in the evening, when the wear and worry of the day has sensibly told upon the freshness of my mind, is unedifying, I will not on any account make my conscience a law for my brothers, but will fully believe that he may and does find edification in a different view of the subject, or at all events that he thinks (surely a good and noble sentiment) that his own private edification is to be postponed to that of his flock. Only then, if I entirely abstain from judging him, I shall expect that, in that reciprocity of charity which the Apostle enjoins, he shall abstain from "despising" me, and not call me party-names or think me narrow and scrupulous, because his novel practice does not approve itself to my feelings.

Having thus endeavoured to place before our readers, at greater length perhaps than some might think necessary, what has been said upon the subject by persons of weight in the Church at the present time, we are now in a position to examine for ourselves the different authorities on which these statements and arguments are founded in reference to the evening Communion.

We turn, in the first instance, to the Holy Scriptures, and we trust that in doing so we shall be kept free from all the unhappy bias and prejudice which seem in a most remarkable manner to influence good men when they write upon this subject. There are three questions which naturally suggest themselves—What inference is to be drawn from the original institution of the Lord's Supper? Is there any light thrown upon the subject from the early history of the Church in the Book of the Acts? What instruction do the Epistles give us in connection with the Holy Communion? The fact, of course, is not disputed that our Blessed Lord instituted the Sacred Ordinance in the evening. The Gospel narrative is clear upon this point. "Now, when the even was come He sat down with the twelve." And why was this? It was the time originally appointed for the Feast of the Passover. "The whole assembly of the congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening." "Ye shall let nothing remain of it until the morning." Thus the Lord's Supper, the Memorial Feast of Christ our Passover being sacrificed for us, was instituted in the evening. And what is the only inference that we can fairly draw from this circumstance? Surely that, in the absence of any direct command upon the subject, the time which our Blessed Lord Himself chose for the Institution is the fittest for celebration, or, at all events, the time which should be least open to objection. But what does Canon Ashwell say in reference to this?—

> We ask, Was there any special reason for our Lord instituting it in the evening which does not apply to later cases? And we soon see that there was. For what is the Eucharist? It is a developed Passover, and being thus the Passover's successor, it was absolutely necessary for its institution to be at the Passover hour, which was in the evening. There was a reason, then, for His instituting it at this particular hour; but to make this example binding without further authority, when the Passover with its hour had passed away, and with the universal practice of the primitive Church against you, is, to say the least, a dangerous proposal.

But no one has ever sought, at least in our day, to make the example binding. The strongest advocates of Evening Communions have only asked for liberty to celebrate at the original time of institution. And so far from the universal practice of the Primitive Church being against them, we shall presently

show that it was quite the other way. But Canon Ashwell says further:—

> Add to this that, as the Passover was itself a commemorative hour, so it is only natural that the Communion hour should also be a commemorative hour, and that as the Passover at evening commemorated the evening of deliverance from Egypt, so the Communion at early morning commemorated the victory of Him who, at early morning, rose again for our deliverance from Satan.

Now, this may have been Canon Ashwell's view of the Lord's Supper, and it may be the view of many others; but we have no hesitation in saying that it is not the object and meaning of the ordinance as taught in Scripture and by the Church of England. We agree with him that as the Passover hour was a commemorative hour, so it is only natural that the Communion hour should also be a commemorative hour. But of what is the Lord's Supper a commemoration? Is it a memorial of His Resurrection? We should then certainly expect to have the feast observed "very early in the morning, on the first day of the week." But this is not what our Church and Holy Scripture teach as the meaning of the rite. It is a commemoration of *Christ's death*, which took place in the afternoon, or at even. For this reason the Holy Supper was instituted at the evening hour; and we believe that there would be much less danger of the true meaning of the ordinance being overlooked if the later hour were more generally observed. Our Church says, "Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained? For a continual remembrance of *the sacrifice of the death of Christ*, and of the benefits which we receive thereby." The word of Scripture is equally explicit, "As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do so show *the Lord's death* till He come."

Passing from the institution, as recorded in the Gospels, to the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, we shall find that the evening hour, no doubt on the grounds we have stated, was the time observed by the immediate followers of our Lord. Such a thing as early Communion is not once mentioned in the New Testament. But the account of St. Paul's sojourn at Troas, in Acts xx., should satisfy any unprejudiced mind as to the matter of Evening Communion in the early Church. Why Canon Ashwell should not refer to this we cannot say, except that he had asserted that the universal practice of the Primitive Church was against us. We shall simply content ourselves by quoting the valuable remarks of Bishop Wordsworth upon the passage:—

> It appears probable that this meeting for breaking of bread took place on the evening of Sunday. It appears, then, that this was a stated day and hour for Christian assemblies; not, perhaps, without

some reference to the fact mentioned by St. John concerning the first Lord's day of the Christian Church: "The same day at evening, being the first day of the week, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, 'Peace be unto you.'" The Holy Supper was instituted on an evening, and it was towards evening when our Lord took bread and blessed it, and gave it to the two disciples at Emmaus. Observe the intimation given that the primitive Christians assembled specially on the Lord's Day for the reception of the Eucharist, and for hearing the Word.

Having thus noticed the original institution, and the reference to the practice of the Early Church, it remains for us to consider any instructions on the subject which may be found in the Epistles. Here, again, we must refer to Canon Ashwell. He writes:—

> Once, and once only, is Evening Communion discussed in the New Testament, and then it is where St. Paul has to repress the scandal accompanying it with such exceeding sternness. Prone to laxity, luxury, and party-spirit, it does not speak well for the practice of Evening Communions that it was in the Corinthian Church alone that we find it prominent.

Such a statement from such a theologian is most unfair, and certainly misleading as to the real facts of the case. It is true that there is but the one Epistle which refers to the Evening Communion, but it is the only Epistle in which there is any reference whatever to the Lord's Supper. The candid reader will see at once, on reading 1 Cor. xi., that the *Evening* Communion is not the subject of discussion, but the abuses which had arisen at the Lord's Supper from the Agapæ, or Love feasts, which preceded the celebration. We are thankful, however, for the reference to the Evening Communion, even in an incidental manner, as the Apostle therein confirms on the very highest authority all that we have been endeavouring to place before our readers. He received of the Lord Himself in special revelation all that he declares upon the subject; and two things are plain —one that the institution was at night, and the other that the object of the institution was to show Christ's death. And what is further so very remarkable in connection with this passage, is that, if the time of celebration was the real cause of these evils in the Corinthian Church, the inspired Apostle who had received direct communications from the Lord upon the subject, does not at once change the hour to the morning as was necessary, it is said, in the churches at a subsequent period. Canon Ashwell boldly says that this was what the Apostle actually did, as indicated by the words, "The rest will I set in order when I come." But this we shall be able to show was not the case, as we proceed to examine the practice of the Church in the first four centuries. We feel that up to the present point in our

consideration of the subject, it is conclusive that if we had nothing but the Scriptures to guide us, from the original institution, from the practice of the Early Church, and from the teaching of the Apostle, we have the highest authority for Evening Communions.

But while there can be no doubt from Scripture that in the Apostolic age the administration of the Lord's Supper took place in the evening, after the pattern of its original institution, and as a memorial of Christ's death, it is at the same time certain that within the four succeeding centuries this practice was very generally changed. The Evening Communion was gradually superseded by the early celebration, until at the Council of Carthage, in 393, we find it decreed as one of the Canons, "The Sacrament of the Altar shall always be celebrated fasting, except on the anniversary of its institution, Cæna Domini (Maundy Thursday)." It was not, however, till far later on in the history of the Church, as may be gathered from scattered notices of the practice, that Evening Communion was altogether forbidden, if it was ever completely suppressed. But the important question for us is, how and by what authority was this change brought about in the time of celebration? Was it, as some would have us believe, by the direction of the Holy Spirit, guiding the Church according to the promise of her Divine Master? Or, was it from the circumstances of the time, and the persecutions which beset the Church, that the Christians were compelled to abandon the evening hour, and assemble in the early morning, and that thus in many respects the whole character of the ordinance was altered? Tertullian, who flourished about the beginning of the third century, is the first to make mention of the Early Communion. In the "De Coronâ," he says,—

> The Sacrament of the Eucharist, which the Lord hath commanded to be eaten at meal-times, and enjoined to be taken by all, we take *also* at the assemblies before daybreak, and from the hand of none but the presidents.

From which we gather that at this time the early celebration had begun, though the Evening Communion was still the general practice, as may be inferred from two other passages by the same writer. In the "Ad Uxorem,"—

> Who finally will without anxiety endure her absence all the night long at the Paschal Solemnities? Who will, without some suspicion of his own, let her go to that Lord's Supper which they defame?

And, again, in the "Apologeticus," he says that the Christians are described as doing all kinds of wickedness after the Communion when the lights had been extinguished. Subsequent writers might be quoted, as Cyprian, in his Epistle lxii. to Cæcilius, on the subject of the Mixed Cup; Gregory Nazianzen,

Orat. xlv., in "Sanctum Pascha;" Augustine, in his Letter 118, to Januarius, and others of a later date, to show that while undoubtedly the Early Communion was becoming the general practice of the Church, the Evening Communion was gradually, but by no means at once, falling into disuse. But it will be sufficient to give the following passage from Bingham's "Antiquities" (Bk. xv. ch. vii. sec. 9), which, in condensing the quotation from Cyprian, furnishes at the same time a very fair account of the whole matter:—

All he [Cyprian] pleads for upon this point, is only this, that the general custom of the Church to celebrate the Eucharist in the morning only, was not against the rule of Christ, though he gave it in the evening after supper; because Christ had a particular reason for what He did, which He did not intend should oblige the Church. Christ offered in the evening to signify the evening or end of the world; *but we offer in the morning to celebrate our Saviour's resurrection.* And he gives another reason why they did not celebrate in the evening generally, as in the morning, *because the people could not as well all come together in the evening as in the morning;* by which it is plain, in Cyprian's time there was no absolute rule to forbid communicating after supper, though the practice began generally to be disused, and the common custom was to receive fasting and at morning service.

We have placed certain words in italics to point out two things which are specially worthy of the attention of our readers —first, how completely the object of the Lord's Supper was altered by the change to the early celebration, "We offer in the morning *to celebrate our Saviour's resurrection.*" Though, strangely enough, it would be shown how Cyprian contradicts himself, if we had quoted directly from his own writings and had given the continuation of the letter:—

And because we make mention of his Passion [he says] in all sacrifices (for the Lord's Passion is the sacrifice which we offer) *we ought to do nothing else than what He did.* For Scripture says, "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till He come."

And, secondly, it is important to notice how Cyprian, at the time the change was taking place, argues in the very same way for the Early Communion then, as so many are arguing for the Evening Communion now. *It was a time most convenient for the people.* But under what circumstances, or by what authority, was the alteration made in the hour of celebration? Was it by the direct guidance and superintendence of the Holy Spirit in the Church? We surely cannot say this. It is true that Augustine says about fasting Communion,—

So it pleased the Holy Ghost that, for the honour of so great a Sacrament, the Lord's Body should enter into the mouth of a Christian

before any other food, and therefore this custom is observed by the whole world.

But this only shows what error had arisen on the subject of the Lord's Supper. The change of hour was not the result of any general council making a decree. And we can hardly suppose that the time of institution by Christ, which was closely followed in Apostolic times, and not altered by St. Paul when dealing with the abuses in the Church of Corinth, was set aside by the Holy Spirit, whose work in the Church is to bring the things of Christ to our remembrance. No, we believe that an impartial study of Church history in the first few centuries will lead us to the conclusion that, owing to persecution, the Christians were obliged to meet early in the morning, before day, to celebrate the Eucharist in their religious assemblies. Thus, the early hour came to be regarded as the proper time for celebration, and the Evening Communion fell gradually into disuse, except in those churches and districts unvisited by persecution. But whether this was for the good of the Church, or not, the after history of the Church will show. We believe ourselves that it led to a complete change in the object and purpose of the Sacrament; that it introduced fasting Communion and all the many superstitions which culminated finally in the errors of Paschasius. This, however, is not our business at present. We have only endeavoured to show in its true light in the first four centuries the practice of Evening Communion.

But it remains for us to inquire, and it will be only necessary to do so very briefly, what may fairly be taken to be the rule of the Church of England, as gathered from the Book of Common Prayer. We have already intimated that we have no desire in this argument to set up the Evening Communion as against the Early Celebration. For our own part we consider the time as quite immaterial. Our great desire is to give every opportunity to the masses of the people to enjoy the blessings and privileges of the Holy Communion, and so we have been led thus earnestly to contend for the evening celebration. But if it really comes to a question as to which is the more in accordance with the rule of our Church, the earlier or later hour, there cannot be a doubt from the Communion Office as to which is the more orthodox. The truth is, that our Church has wisely fixed upon no particular hour, leaving it an open matter for the benefit of her children. But she has made it very distinct and clear that in the service the Holy Communion *shall follow the sermon and mattins*—and, in fact, there is an old canon which expressly forbids the celebration of the Holy Communion before mattins. We hope that many of our friends who pride them-

selves on their strict attention to the letter of the law, and are so bitter in their opposition to the advocates of Evening Communion, will at least lay this point seriously to heart. If it comes to a matter of Church rule, it is clear where the right is. But, as we have said, we have no desire in the least to press a point of this kind. Our object has been, by examining all authorities, to show those who are advocates of the Evening administration, with a view to bringing the people into the full Communion of the Church, that they are perfectly right, and are justified in doing so. We must adapt the services of our Church to meet all the changes and exigencies of the times. If she is to retain her high position as the National Church, it will only be as she thus meets the religious wants of the nation. It is clear from the manner in which our churches are crowded in the evening, as compared with the earlier services, that the evening service is that which the masses are best able to attend. On this ground, therefore, although we ourselves may prefer the midday celebration, we strongly recommend the practice of administering the Holy Communion in the evening.

PRESBYTER.

Reviews.

Memoir of Henry Venn, B.D. By WILLIAM KNIGHT, M.A., Rector of Pitt Portion, Tiverton, and Chaplain to his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury; formerly Secretary of the Church Missionary Society. A New Edition. With Portrait and Appendix. Pp. 515. Seeley, Jackson, & Halliday.

IN the CHURCHMAN of June, 1880, in reviewing the "Memoir of the Rev. H. Venn," published in May, we gave a sketch of Mr. Venn's career down to the year 1841. The CHURCHMAN of November contained an article, written by one who well knew Henry Venn, dealing with the second portion of the biography, that portion which relates to the last thirty of the fifty years of Mr. Venn's ministerial life—1841–1872—during which he was the honorary secretary of the Church Missionary Society. The volume which was published in May, 1880, contained, as our readers may remember, "The Missionary Secretariat," written by Mr. Knight, and a "Biographical Sketch," by Mr. Venn's sons. We have now before us a new edition of this work, a revised and compressed Memoir, prepared, as the Preface tells us, "at the instance of many friends, who hoped that such a life and such a character might be more widely studied if presented in a less costly form." For the book as it now appears Mr. Knight is solely responsible. He has adopted "the valuable Biographical Sketch almost without change," endeavouring to carry forward, as far as the materials at his command enabled, a record of the latter and more important years of his life. The additional matter to which Mr. Knight has had access will be found full of interest and highly characteristic.

"I have had the opportunity," he writes, "of availing myself more largely of his private journal; many important and graphic letters have been added; and I have to express my thanks to the Rev. Prebendary Wilson, the Rev. Canon Clayton, and the Rev. G. T. Fox, for very valuable additions to the correspondence; and last, but not least, to Miss Caroline E. Stephen, for a life-like portraiture of her revered uncle." Mr. Knight, in his Preface, further states, that in order not to interfere with the continuity of the work, he has, along with other documents, removed to the Appendix Mr. Venn's own narratives of the early years of the Church Missionary Society, and his Suggestions for the Organization of Native Churches. To the new edition, also, have been added Mr. Venn's own memoranda of his share in the debates of the two notable Commissions of which he was a member. The result of the various changes and additions made by Mr. Knight—made, we venture to remark, with literary tact and good judgment—is a really interesting as well as valuable volume; not too bulky, not too costly; full of useful matter, but very readable.

To show the arrangement in the present edition, we may quote the Table of Contents, abridged, as follows:—

Early Years, 1796–1827.
Ministerial and Domestic, 1827–1839.
Letters, 1835–1846.
The C.M.S.
Private Journal, 1849–1856.
Personal Traits.
Letters, 1846–1872.
The Close.
Appendix.

In the Appendix, as we have said, appear, with other valuable documents, memoranda of Mr. Venn's speeches in the Jerusalem Chamber, on Clerical Subscription, in the year 1864, and on Ritual in the year 1867–8. Mr. Venn's share in these two Royal Commissions is mentioned in the "Recollections" of the Earl of Chichester. "Few of the members of these Commissions," says the noble Earl, "came to the consideration of the subjects referred to them with a fuller or more accurate knowledge of the questions involved."

The resolutions proposed by Mr. Venn, in 1867, have an especial interest at the present time; and those of our readers who have the first edition of the Memoir, will be glad to see them in the CHURCHMAN. We make no apology for quoting them in full:—

Resolutions proposed for adoption by the Rev. H. VENN.

1. That it appears, from evidence taken by the Commissioners, that during the last few years a diversity of practice has arisen in the ornaments used in the churches and chapels of the United Church of England and Ireland, and in the vestments worn by the ministers thereof at the time of their ministrations.

2. That such diversity in the vestments has been of very recent origin, there having been almost perfect uniformity for the three previous centuries in the vestments worn—a uniformity to which witness has been borne by the consentient testimony of the episcopal and archidiaconal Articles of Inquiry during that period; and that the practice with respect to the ornaments of the Church during the same period attained almost the same degree of uniformity.

3. That it is in the highest degree advisable that the clergy should have clear and definite directions having the force of the law to guide them in such matters.

4. That, nevertheless, the rubric on ornaments and vestments has received different interpretations from high legal authorities, and consequently the clergy are left in a state of doubt and uncertainty as to what is required of them in these matters.

5. That as the resumption of certain ministerial vestments has been attempted by a comparatively small party in the Church, Her Majesty's injunctions to the Commissioners to secure a general uniformity of practice can only be fairly attained by checking the novel usages of a very small minority in favour of the usages of an overwhelming majority having the sanction of three centuries in their support.

6. That as it appears to the Commissioners that some of the clergy who have adopted the peculiar vestments have done so with a view of assimilating the services of the Church to those which existed before the Reformation, and that a very large majority of the members of the Church regard the practices in question in the same light, it is essential to the future peace and welfare of the Church that the directions of the Rubric should be made clear and explicit in favour of the usage of the last three centuries, fortified as it is by the order of the 58th Canon (1604) passed by the Clergy themselves in Convocation, and by the unanimous voice of the Bishops and Archdeacons of the Church during the same period, as proclaimed in their Articles of Inquiry at their visitations.

H. VENN.

In a speech on July 18th, 1867—headed in the work before us—"Fears of Secession not to be considered in Legislation," Mr. Venn said:—

If I did not regard the time of the Commission too precious, I should have no difficulty in showing the essential difference between the position of Whitefield and Wesley and the Ritualists of the present day—between the liberty accorded to zealous men to preach the Gospel of salvation to crowded churches, and liberty accorded to innovators upon the usage of three hundred years in the matter of vestments and ornaments; but I content myself with simply entering a protest against the analogy which it has been attempted to establish.

In the same speech Mr. Venn pointed out that the introduction of vestments is a step towards the introduction of Romish doctrine. He entirely concurred with the Bishop of London that the exclusion of vestments must be made absolute—that this was the main matter referred to in the terms of their Commission as "essential." Upon all non-essentials, "he trusted, he should be found as willing to make concessions, and to allow to bishops a controlling and dispensing power, as any other member of the Commission." He would venture once more (we still quote from the memorandum) to urge upon his brother Commissioners the importance of acting upon their own conviction of what was best for the interests of the Church as an institution for maintaining the truth, and instructing the people in the fear and love of God. He trusted that none would depart from this principle in deference to the supposed wishes of any considerable body of the clergy, or from the fear of secession. He had no apprehension of anything like a secession; but, he added, "amongst those who are hovering between the Church of Rome and the Church of England, a few might leave us if our decision be at variance with their wishes."

On Dec. 8th, 1867, the position of the Communion Table being under discussion, Mr. Venn pointed out that the removal of the Table from the place where the Romish altar had stood was one of the most important and significant acts of the Reformers. It swept away all idea of the Mass. So long as the present rubric remained, the dangers of the Laudian position, at the east end of the chancel, were minimized. A resolution which took away the lawful alternative of placing the Table within the body of the church, he argued, would compromise a great Protestant principle. Here and elsewhere, we may remark, Mr. Venn's argument is terse and lucid; he touches the point; no words are wasted, while no flaw can be detected, for he had taken pains to be thoroughly well-informed. The disastrous results of Laud's policy he touches upon with a note of warning really needed in these days.

In a speech on the repetition of the words of administration (Jan. 30

1868), Mr. Venn gives some very interesting facts. Dr. Scott, son of Lord Stowell, it appears, was consulted by the Rev. J. Venn, who had been inhibited because he repeated the words once when he delivered the bread to a rail-full. Mr. Venn, and his brother John, had recourse to the best legal advice which Doctors Commons afforded; and Dr. Scott's opinion was (1) as to *ambiguity*: there being an ambiguity in the expression ". . . . to any one . . . ." the bishop must interpret and decide according to the preface to the Prayer Book; and (2) as to *necessity*, (in cases were there are large numbers of communicants): the Bishop being bound by his office to see the law of the Church carried out, he alone could give any sanction for its relaxation. After receiving this opinion Mr. Venn's brother at once, of course, gave way; he delivered the Communion to near 400 communicants individually. His Bishop, however, shortly afterwards, advised him to revert to the old plan. The conclusion drawn, and rightly, as we think, is that *where the Bishop sanctions it*, the minister is justified in repeating the words once to a "rail-full" of communicants.[1]

A letter from the Rev. C. Baring, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and subsequently of Durham, to the Rev. John Venn, in the year 1845, is one of the treasures of the new edition. Mr. Baring, one of the noblest men the Church of England has ever known, took a lively interest in the secretariat of Mr. Venn.[2] He wrote:—

I have now been almost a year and a half in constant attendance at the Committees; and much as I value your brother's talents generally, it is only there that his real value can be seen, as a most influential and successful promoter of his Master's Kingdom: his calm judgment and long-sighted views of results, his firmness and settled opinions upon all doctrinal and ecclesiastical matters, his kindness of heart and manner, his straightforward honesty and candour,—all these have won him not merely the confidence of the Committee, but have given him a power with these and authority which no other secretary has before possessed. Again and again have I heard from the lips of many of the Committee almost the same language—that they considered it one of the most marked proofs of God's goodness to the Society, the having raised up such a person at a most critical time, without whose aid they could scarcely have hoped to have weathered the storms which were surrounding them.

Miss C. E. Stephen's Recollections are also added. They derive, perhaps (says Mr. Knight), an especial interest from their being the estimate of one whose associations were not confined to those over whom Mr. Venn exercised a leading influence.

"My father[3] used to say that my uncle lived in a 'paradise of certain-"ties,' and so, indeed, he did. The effect of his 'steadfast immovable' "grasp, not only of divine things, but of all the deeper and broader truths "of human nature was to reassure weaker souls, and, by the sense of "stability and security it imparted, to afford a shelter for the freest play "of natural feeling and of innocent merriment. Indeed, his abundant, "racy humour, and his unfailing sweetness of temper, made a perpetual "sunshine around him in family life. To me, there was always a strange

[1] It is quite unnecessary, perhaps, to add, that the words of the Prayer Book should not be altered, *i.e.* the plural form should not be used.

[2] In a deeply interesting letter from Lord Chichester appear some striking sentences. The venerated President of the Church Missionary Society remarks that perhaps Mr. Venn's "greatest service to the Society and to the cause of missions was his firm unflinching adherence to the great Evangelical principles upon which the Society was originally founded."

[3] The Right Hon. Sir James Stephen, K.C.B., who married Mr. Venn's second sister.

"sense of freedom in his presence. He could afford to sit loose in trifles, "and there was nothing severe in his positiveness. He would give his "opinion with a characteristic decision even upon subjects upon which he "had no special knowledge; but he would welcome everyone else's opinion, "however opposite to his own, and however inferior to his their experience "or information. In his capacious sympathy he would find room and tender "indulgence for everyone's fancies, even for the minutest of feminine "weaknesses. None but those who lived in close daily intimacy with "him could fathom the self-denying tenderness of his dealing with others. "There was no talk about it; no apparent putting of himself on one side. "Yet, somehow, the smooth sides of things did invariably turn towards "others; and anything troublesome or uncomfortable would naturally "gravitate towards him, and be silently disposed of by him, unless we "were perpetually on the watch to prevent his already overburdened "strength being spent in sparing us young and idle ones some little dis- "comfort. Not that he would treat anyone as idle or useless. On the con- "trary, he would set us all to work, and would, at times, work the willing "and able ones rather hard. He was openhanded in everything, and would "willingly give anyone a share in his work. The impulse to give was most "characteristic of him: time, money, sympathy, attention—all were ready "to be bestowed at a moment's notice. But there must have been a stern "self-control ordering everything, for there never was any waste, or any "running short. He had to a remarkable degree the power of keeping "things in their proper places; of laying aside the most anxious work "when his part for the time was done. He would go out from heavy "work into his garden for a spare ten minutes with a mind as free as if "Salisbury Square had never existed. No one surely ever had a keener "delight in Nature, or enjoyed it with a more elastic freshness of spirit. "Those were indeed happy days, when, after endless patiently accepted "delays, he would at last get free for his short yearly holiday, and would "abandon himself with the innocent whole-hearted glee of a child to the "enjoyment of expeditions on the Scotch or Welsh hills—barometer or "spy-glass in hand-full of schemes for measurements to be taken, or "observations to be made, but first, with almost equal interest, showing "points of view for the sketches of the party, and comfortable resting- "places for the less active ones. And then in the evenings how he would "delight in the hour or two spent together in talking over the adventures "of the day, or telling stories (who else ever told them as he did?) of old "times, or in reading and discussion. One year I remember his choosing "the Epistle to the Romans for our evening reading, and many and lively "were the discussions to which particular passages gave rise. He made it "wonderfully easy for the younger generation to speak their minds to him, "even upon points of difference of a very serious kind. He met one with "such downright fairness and respect for whatever was serious and genuine "that it was impossible not to be frank with him. And to me, at least, "though there were to the last some points upon which I could not see "'eye to eye' with him, there was in his utterances upon religious subjects "a weight of testimony such as I think but one other human voice ever "carried with it to my mind. It was not the fact of his 'certainty' that so "impressed me, but a sense of a depth of the experience out of which his "convictions had been wrought. The texture of his faith was of an ex- "traordinary solidity; and to those who knew him long and intimately "it derived an awful authority, from the holiness and the pure uprightness "of his most faithful life. None who so knew him could fail to know "certainly that his life was fed from within by a deep and fresh spring of "'living water, springing up into everlasting life.'"

C. E. S.

We had marked other passages in the new edition of this Memoir for quotation and comment; but, from lack of space, we must content ourselves with earnestly recommending it. No book, probably, is better calculated to explain the true principles of sound and practical Evangelical Churchmanship. We ought to add, perhaps, that the book is well printed in good, clear type.

Ritual Conformity. Interpretations of the Rubrics of the Prayer Book, agreed upon by a Conference held at All Saints, Margaret Street, 1880--1881. Parker & Co. 1881.

(*Concluding Notice.*)

IT only remains to consider the Interpreters' view of the Ornaments Note. A brief sketch of its history may be prefixed. The Ornaments Note stood in King James's Prayer Book, of 1604, exactly as Elizabeth had left it. The only objection raised at the Hampton Court Conference which bore on it is thus recorded by Fuller, ("Ch. Hist." iii. 187):—

Mr. Knewstubs: I take exception at the wearing of the surplice, a kind of garment used by the priests of Isis.

His Majesty: I did not think, till of late, it had been borrowed from the heathen, because commonly called "a rag of Popery." Seeing now we border not upon heathens, neither are any of them conversant with or commorant amongst us, thereby to be confirmed in Paganism, I see no reason but for comeliness sake it may be continued.

Mr. Chaderton afterwards fell on his knees and requested that the surplice might not be urged on some godly ministers in Lancashire, especially on the vicar of Rochdale. As the king seemed inclined to give way, Mr. Knewstubs made a similar request for Suffolk; but this roused his majesty's ire, and he "concluded on unity and conformity."

Thus the Ritual question of the day was "Surplice or no Surplice," and no other garments savouring of pre-Reformation ceremonial were brought to the front.

In the Millenary Petition, presented at about the same time, various matters of complaint touching Church Services were brought forward, and among them that the cap and surplice should not be urged (194).

The Prayer Book was issued the same year; and after Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, there was inserted the King's Proclamation, in which it was stated that certain explanations had been agreed to after the consultation he had with the bishops and others (conforming and non-conforming). All persons were now required to conform, and offenders were to be punished.

This same year came *the Canons*, which are to our Church what college statutes are to a college; and the directions as to vestments and ritual given therein, are the Canonical interpretation of the Ornaments Note and of other Rubrics, and must hold good as such, until that interpretation is overthrown by further Canonical authority.

The directions are remarkably explicit as to vestments. The twenty-fourth Canon gives order, that in Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches the principal minister at the Holy Communion shall use a decent Cope, being assisted with the Gospeller and Epistler agreeably according to the Advertisements published *anno 7 Eliz.*

The twenty-fifth Canon orders that in these same Churches when there is no Communion, it shall be sufficient to wear surplices. The official clergy (Deans, &c.), being graduates, shall daily, at the times both of prayer and preaching, wear hoods with their surplices.

The seventeenth Canon also gives rules for University students to

wear surplices and hoods in their chapels on Sundays, Holy-days, and Eves. So much for Colleges.

The eighteenth Canon states that "no man shall cover his head in the church or chapel in the time of Divine Service, except he have some infirmity; in which case let him wear a night-cap or coif." This Canon, however, is aimed against irreverence on the part of the laity, rather than against birettas, &c., which do not seem to have been in vogue at that time.

We now come to the directions for Parish Churches.

The fifty-eighth Canon directs that every minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the Sacraments or other rites of the Church, shall wear a decent and comely surplice, with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish. And if any question arise touching the matter, decency or comeliness thereof, it shall be decided by the discretion of the Ordinary. Graduates shall wear their hoods, at such times, upon their surplices. It shall be lawful for non-graduates to wear upon their surplices, instead of hoods, some decent tippet of black, so it be not of silk.

Preaching is not included under this Canon, and is dealt with as distinct from "ministration" all through the Canons. The right to minister did not, and does not, carry with it the right to preach. The seventy-fourth Canon gives certain directions for the apparel (*i.e.*, the outer garments) of ecclesiastical persons, from archbishops down to curates, and from head to foot, first in the public capacity, secondly, when at a journey, and thirdly, in private houses and their studies. The Canon does not, indeed, name preaching, but in regulating the academical dress as gown, hood, and square cap, practically determines that as the proper costume of the preacher, unless ordered otherwise.

We now pass on to the Prayer Book of 1662. A great deal had happened since the time of James I., and one most important step had been taken by Charles I., in 1637; a Prayer Book had been drawn up for use in the Church of Scotland. This book is a link in the history of our Rubrics, and was evidently before the revisers of 1662. Its influence may be seen in a number of minute changes, but especially in two things, first, that to some extent it reverted to King Edward's first Book (1549) in the arrangement of the Communion Service, and secondly, that the word "minister" was changed therein to presbyter, a change which paved the way for the introduction of the word priest into a considerably large number of Rubrics in our Prayer Book.

The Ornaments Note[1] in the Scotch Prayer Book throws no light on the present question, and we pass on to Charles II.'s Prayer Book.

As the Prayer Book of 1604 was preceded by the Hampton Court Conference, so the Prayer Book of 1662 was preceded by the Savoy Conference. A paper of exceptions against the Book of 1604 had been drawn up as a preliminary step by Bishop Reynolds, Mr. Calamy, and others.

Under the eighteenth general head exception is taken to the fact that public worship may not be celebrated by any minister that does not wear a surplice, and when the writers of the paper come to particulars they remark on the Ornaments Note: "Forasmuch as this Rubric seemeth to bring back the cope, albe, &c., and other vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer Book, 5 and 6, Edward VI., and so our reasons alleged against ceremonies under our eighteenth general exception, we desire that it may be wholly left out."

[1] It runs thus:—And here is to be noted, that the presbyter or minister at the time of the Communion, and at other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the church as are prescribed, or shall be by his Majesty, or his successors, according to the Act of Parliament provided in that behalf.

The Bishops, in their answer to this last point, content themselves by saying:—

For the reasons given in our answer to the eighteenth general, whither you refer us, we think it fit that the rubric continue as it is.

And their answer to the eighteenth general begins thus:—

We are now come to the main and principal demand as is pretended—viz., the abolishing the laws which impose any ceremonies, especially three—the surplice, the sign of the cross, and kneeling. These are the yoke, which, if removed, there might be peace.

After examining with some force, not to say asperity, the reasons for such proposals, they continue (§ 16):—

This in brief may here suffice for the surplice; that reason and experience teach that decent ornaments and habits preserve reverence, and are held, therefore, necessary to the solemnity of royal acts and acts of justice, and why not as well to the solemnity of religious worship. And in particular no habit more suitable than white linen, which resembles purity and beauty, wherein angels have appeared (Rev. xv.), fit for those whom the Scripture calls angels; and this habit was ancient. [They add a reference to Chrys. "Hom." 60, ad Antioch.]

The Ornaments Note was thus one out of a large number of rubrics to which Baxter's party made objection, but the Bishops did not deign to discuss the objection in detail. Other things were more important, and came up again and again. Bishop Cosin suggested that any points which objectors considered contrary to God's Word, or inexpedient, should be referred to Convocation. Baxter, in his answer, reverted to the cross at Baptism, the surplice in ministration, and kneeling at Communion, but to no other vestments or ornaments ("Reliquiæ Baxterianæ," 340–343).

This was in 1661. In the following year the new Prayer Book was issued, having prefixed to it Elizabeth's Act and the new and more stringent Act of Charles II.

The Ornaments Note was shortened, the reference to Elizabeth's Act being left out of it, and the old ornaments for church and minister to be in use. Is there anything in the change of expression in the Note which would invalidate the canonical interpretation of it as established in 1604? Were any new Canons introduced, rendering the Canons of 1604 obsolete, and ordering the restoration of those church ornaments and vestments of 1549 which had become practically illegal? There are no such Canons. Thus the old canonical rules stand—viz., the cope at the Communion for colleges and cathedrals, the surplice for ministers in parish churches, and the gown for preaching.

That this is the case is further to be shown from the fact that we possess the Visitation Articles of the very Bishops to whom we owe this amended form of the Ornaments Note—Archbishops Sheldon and Sancroft, Bishops Cosin, Wren, Sanderson, and others—who with one voice enforce the surplice as the vestment for public prayers and ministering the Sacraments and other rites of the Church. Thus any interpretation of the Ornaments Note which would introduce a vestment instead of or over and above the surplice for the administration of the Lord's Supper, excepting the cope in certain cases, goes against both the canonical interpretation of King James's Prayer Book and the official judgment of those who revised the Prayer Book in 1662.

How it is that the stole or scarf is retained, or how it is that the cope has dropped out, remains a mystery, so far as Church documents are concerned; but, with these exceptions, the duty of the minister as to vestments seems clear as daylight.

But what say the interpreters to these things? They shut their eyes to the canonical and official commentaries on the Note as given in 1604 or 1662; they shut their eyes to the fact that Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, referred to in the Note as it used to stand, provided for further action as to vestments; and that this action would become (and, by the issue of the Advertisements, *did* become) an authoritative explanation of the way in which the Note was to be obeyed. To all this they shut their eyes; and they read the Note as if there had been no official acts settling its interpretation in the reigns of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles II. More than this: they pass glibly over the "Erastian" words, "*By the Authority of Parliament*," which have been significantly retained in the Note all through the changes of the Prayer Book. These words impose considerable restrictions on the usages which might be adopted on the supposition that no changes had been authorized since 1552. But, as we have seen, such changes have been authorized,[1] and it is in vain that we are told to ignore the documents of the past 330 years, and go back to that date.

The pamphlet on Ritual Conformity which we have been criticizing will hardly commend itself to the student of the Prayer Book as an accurate exposition. It cannot even be called ingenious. It will be but a broken reed for any incumbent to rely upon when refusing to obey the counsels of his Bishop.

How far a Bishop has a dispensing power is another matter. Probably it would be right to say that wherever long-established custom has departed from the letter of the rubric, wherever there are departures from the rubric in order to meet the changed circumstances of the people, or "for more expedition," or for "edification," wherever there are two possible interpretations of a rubric, wherever the Church as a whole or the congregation in particular takes offence, on some tangible grounds, at the proceedings of an incumbent—in these and similar cases a Bishop is called upon to intervene, and to see that the letter of the ritual is not strained too tightly nor relaxed too freely. As for the phrase, "canonical obedience," of which we have heard a good deal of late, it is not to be found in the Prayer Book, and can only mean obedience to the Bishops when acting in accordance with the Canons of 1604 and the Prayer Book of 1662, and with the law of the land and the rule of God's Word. The last question and answer in the Service for the Ordination of Priests seem to shut us up to obedience to our Bishops in all matters of ceremonial and rubrical observance on which there can be a shadow of doubt. And we may be thankful that the laity, as well as the clergy, may resort to the Bishop for help and guidance in these matters.

It only remains to be asked, and it is done in no offensive spirit, what is the real reason why certain obsolete and illegal ornaments and vestments are urged upon us? The answer is very plain. It is because they symbolize (or are supposed to symbolize) pre-Reformation doctrine —not primitive doctrine, but "Catholic," the word "Catholic" being used in a very restricted sense, and not in the grand sense in which we find it in the Prayer Book. Pre-Reformation doctrine called for pre-Reformation ritual. If this can be found in the rubrics, the "Catholic" party are satisfied; if not, the party will break the rubrics, and cover themselves by the assertion that the "Protestant" party do the same

[1] Any student who desires to see a careful discussion of the Queen's advertisements and kindred topics may be referred to a learned pamphlet called "The Rubric; its History and Meaning," by J. Lewis, of the Inner Temple. Hamilton.

This accusation, however, will hardly bear looking into. Every man of sense can perceive that to break the letter of a rubric for more expedition, or for the convenience of the congregation under particular circumstances, where the breach involves no doctrinal change, is one thing; but to break the rubric in letter or spirit in order to get back to that kind of ceremonial, and consequently to that line of teaching, which is abhorrent to Scripture, Articles, and Prayer Book, is another thing. The two cannot be discussed on the same grounds.

R. B. G.

The Formation of Vegetable Mould by the Action of Worms, with Observations on their Habits. By CHARLES DARWIN, LL.D., F.R.S. London: John Murray. 1881.

SINCE John Ray, the pious father of zoology in England, published, two hundred years ago his Essay on the Wisdom of God in Creation, it would be difficult to name a work more fitted to display the apparently insignificant instruments by which the Creator accomplishes stupendous results than the one before us. The almost human intelligence of the dog, the marvellous instinct of the ant and the bee, have in all ages afforded problems for men of science and wonder to the vulgar. But that "worms of the earth," the very emblems of feebleness and insignificance, should not only furnish a congenial object of study to a mind that has aspired to trace the history of creation, but be shown to play a most important part in the economy of nature, and to contribute in no small degree to changes in the aspect of the earth's surface, will take many readers by surprise.

In a paper read before the Geological Society five-and-forty years ago, Mr. Darwin called attention to the fact that cinders and fragments of burnt marl thickly spread over a meadow were found after a few years lying some inches beneath the turf, but still forming an unbroken layer. That this apparent sinking of superficial bodies is due to the quantity of fine earth brought up from below by worms and spread over the surface in the form of castings, was suggested to him at the time by Mr. Wedgwood, of Maer Hall, Staffordshire, but has been since amply demonstrated by Mr. Darwin, and by Von Hensen, in Germany. In fact, as Mr. Darwin puts it, it is probable that the whole vegetable mould of the country has passed many times through the intestinal canals of worms, and would more appropriately be called animal mould than vegetable.

Small as each worm cast may seem, it has been calculated that in one case the total weight raised and spread out in a single year amounted to no less than eighteen tons per acre. In another, twenty-eight years sufficed to bury a dressing of marl twelve to fourteen inches beneath the surface. But more striking was the case of a field adjoining Mr. Darwin's house clothed with an extremely scanty vegetation, but thickly strewn with flints, many of them half the size of a child's head. Gradually, without any aid from man, they all disappeared, the soil improved, and in the course of thirty years the whole field was covered with a soft carpet of verdant grass, and on digging a trench, and cutting the turf off close to the roots, the stones were found full two feet below the grass.

The terraced ledges, so often seen on hill sides, are doubtless due to the same cause, and it is easy to see how denudation, or the erosion of elevated land and filling in of valleys, may be aided by the pulverisation and raising of the subsoil by worms, a process not merely mechanical, but chemical, since Mr. Julien has shown that the so-called "humic acids" are secreted in their stomachs.

The anatomy and physiology of worms Mr. Darwin leaves to others, contenting himself, as is his wont, with close and patient observation of

their habits. He finds that, as regards hearing, they are totally insensible to aërial vibrations, but very sensitive to those of solid bodies with which they may be in contact, as seen by placing flower-pots containing their burrows on a piano, when on striking a single note they instantly retreated. Their smell seems cognisant of food only, for while they speedily scented out pieces of cabbage or of onions buried near them, they were quite indifferent to petroleum or tobacco-juice. If not engaged in feeding they are extremely sensitive to light, though the rudimentary structure of their eyes precludes the possibility of vision.

They draw leaves into their burrows, partly for food, smearing them with a secretion powerfully digestive both of starch and protoplasm, the only case of extra-gastric digestion in the animal kingdom, but strictly analogous to that of the carnivorous plants, *Dionœa*, *Drosera*, and the Pitcher plants demonstrated by Darwin himself, E. Ray Lankester, and others; partly to close their holes against the access of birds; and partly, he believes, to protect themselves from the contact with the cold night air. In this operation they generally seize the leaf by its apex, as the more suited to their purpose, avoiding the leaf-stalk, but choosing that end by preference when it happened to be the narrower. The same selective faculty (intelligence?) was shown when triangular pieces of paper were substituted for leaves, though, on the hypothesis of chance alone, they must at least as often have taken hold of one of the obtuser angles. When, as on gravel walks, there are no leaves, they close the mouths of their holes with heaps of small stones; and a lady, who had repeatedly swept these away, found one night, on going out with a lantern, the worms with their tails fixed in their burrows dragging with their mouths such stones as they could reach. One of these weighed two ounces.

Our space forbids our giving more, but we heartily recommend this study of the work of worms to those of our country friends who take an interest in the humblest creature that breathes as the handiwork of the Almighty.

Short Notices.

Swiss Letters and Alpine Poems. By the late Frances Ridley Havergal. Edited by her sister, J. Miriam Crane. Pp. 340. J. Nisbet & Co.

In a prefatory note by Mrs. Crane we read:—"The world-wide interest excited by the writings and 'Memorials' of my lamented sister, Frances Ridley Havergal, has led her family to think that such of her letters as I have been able to collect, written to her home circle from Switzerland, will be acceptable to her many admirers. Some will feel pleasure in mentally revisiting the sublime scenery she describes with such vigour and simplicity; and others will be interested in observing how unconsciously these letters indicate her enthusiastic nature, her practical ability, and her ardent desire that every one should share her earthly pleasures and her heavenly aspirations." The frontispiece—a pleasing picture—is "Pension Wengen," with the Alps in the background; here, in 1876, Miss Havergal wrote "A Song in the Night," which begins,

I take this pain, Lord Jesus,
From Thine own hand:
The strength to bear it bravely,
Thou wilt command.

I am too weak for effort,
So let me rest,
In trust of sweet submission
On Thine own breast.

For many of those to whom a good book at Christmas is a welcome present, this delightful selection of Swiss Letters, full of soothing songs without music, will prove a real help. The volume, it may be remarked, has a tasteful cover.

Old Proverbs with New Pictures. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.

This is one of the choicest children's books of the season. It contains sixty coloured plates, from original designs "by Lizzie Lawson," with verses to correspond. Of the artistic excellence, even a critic who has no children at his elbow, may write warmly; we ourselves have heard—we may say, and seen—delighted and decided praise. The picture of little folks leading a wooden horse to a brook, with the proverb, "You may lead a horse to the water . . . ." is, perhaps, the prettiest; a little girl's face, as, perplexed, she sighs over the horse's perversity, is "a study." Paper, type, cover, &c., all are of the best.

Gipsy Mike. Firm as a Rock. Pp. 220. J. F. Shaw & Co.

This is a really clever story, with touching passages, and a thread of interest from the first page to the very last. Many readers will be sorry that "Mike," a lad on H.M.S. *Endeavour*, died, but the plot is well developed. In all Messrs. Shaw & Co.'s gift-books, the literary merit is at least of the average order, while the tone is good, and there is some sound religious teaching. These wholesome tales are suited for parish libraries as well as for fireside reading.

Over the Wall. By Ismay Thorn. London: J. F. Shaw & Co.

Some graphic sketches of child life. Two families come to know each other: the children, six of one family and four of the other, the eldest, a boy, being thirteen years of age, make friends over a garden wall. The tale is told with a pleasant naturalness, and is sure to give satisfaction to young readers. This is an attractive book, with some charming illustrations.

All Among the Daisies. By Mrs. Stanley Leathes, Author of "On the Doorsteps." J. F. Shaw & Co.

We are much pleased with this story; unaffected, and winning, its good taste is as conspicuous as its religious aim and temper. "Pearl" *is* a pearl; and Granny and Will (whose voyage and adventures are well described) are sure to become favourites.

The Leisure Hour. 1881.
The Sunday at Home. 1881. R. T. S., Paternoster Row.

These handsome Annuals are always welcome. We read the Magazines each month, and we read out some portions to others. From personal acquaintance, therefore, the present writer can cordially commend these volumes, as sound and good, full of useful and interesting information upon many subjects. For a parish or lending library, we are not acquainted with any works, taking the volumes as a whole, so likely to be really useful; so likely to be well read and to do good. The subjects are well varied, and the treatment is judicious. Some of the papers show ability of no mean order; and there is nothing poor or dull. Young persons, we find, are always pleased to get the work to read, and elders of this or that class and type give their verdict of warm approval. The better educated youths of a country parish, for instance, prefer the

Leisure Hour to everything else; with this, no doubt, the illustrations have much to do. The special features of the volumes have from time to time been mentioned in the CHURCHMAN. We congratulate the editor on the felicitous completion of another portion of his important labours, and, if we may venture so to do, wish him, with the Divine blessing, health and vigour for the duties of a New Year. The power of the religious press, we are persuaded, is even now not sufficiently appreciated by a large proportion of the public.

Church Music. A Popular Sketch. Being a Glance at its Origin, Development, and Present Use. With Illustrations. By the Rev. EDWARD HICKS, B.A., Vicar of Kidsgrove, Staffordshire. Pp. 80. London: John Heywood. 1881.

This is likely to prove "a popular sketch." In its way, it is the best little book we know of. We quite agree with the author that, in a musical point of view, the west gallery is best adapted for the choir.

Early Days in Christian Life. Kindly Words to the Young in their Christian Course. By the Rev. JOHN RICHARDSON, M.A., Vicar of Camden.

Mothers' Meetings: How to Form and Conduct them. With hints for carrying out the agencies which may be usefully employed in connection with them. By the Rev. W. H. PEERS, M.A., Vicar of All Saints, Harrow Weald. Elliot Stock.

These two little books form part of an excellent series now being published by Mr. Stock. . . . . "Small books on Important Subjects," written by such able and representative men as Dr. Flavel Cook, Canon Stowell, Mr. Gordon Calthrop, Mr. Boyd Carpenter, and Dr. Bell; cheap and well printed. Canon Richardson's "Kindly Words" are just what we should expect from a hard-working clergyman of ability and good judgment, who has taken a special interest in the young; so good a work of the kind we have seldom seen. For Mr. Peers' practical manual an introduction has been written by Mr. Boyd Carpenter. The advice given by Mr. Peers is thoroughly good. We think his list of books suitable for a lending library may, in a second edition, be improved; in a country parish, and even in an average country-town parish, the books must, as we think, be very simple; and the religious writings should be of the style of Mr. Power and Mr. Bourdillon.

From Log-Cabin to White House. The Story of President Garfield's Life. By W. M. THAYER. Sixth edition, completing twentieth thousand. Pp. 349. Hodder & Stoughton.

The author of this very interesting Story prepared a book for boys, some sixteen years ago, upon the early life of Abraham Lincoln, entitled "The Pioneer Boy, and how he became President." That work had a large circulation; and it is probable that the present volume may prove as successful. The author was impressed, he says, by the resemblance of General Garfield's early obscurity and struggles, as well as the triumphs of his manhood, to those of Mr. Lincoln. Both statesmen were born in log-cabins, built by their fathers, in the wilderness, for family houses: both were very poor; both were born with talents of the highest order; neither enjoyed early advantages of schools and teachers. At eight years of age Lincoln lost his mother; and when Garfield was eighteen months old he lost his father. Both worked on a farm, chopped wood, and did whatever else was needful for a livelihood, when eight years of age. Both improved every leisure moment in study and reading.

The Clergyman's and Church Worker's Visiting List. A General Register and Complete Record of Church Work and Workers for 1882. Edited by the Rev. F. A. CAVE BROWN CAVE, M.A., Vicar of Longridge. With a Preface by the Bishop of MANCHESTER. London: John Smith & Co., 52, Long Acre.

Of this Register, edited by a clergyman of his diocese, of much energy and experience, the Bishop of Manchester says:—"It is admirably adapted to the purposes which it proposes to serve, and the clergyman who uses it will always have close at hand and ready for reference a succinct but clear conspectus of his parish." We give the "contents," as follows:—Almanack, &c., &c.—Visiting List and Journal—Offertory Memoranda—Sunday and Day School Teachers—Baptismal, Marriage, and Death Registers—Parish Workers—Communicants' Register—Persons Unbaptized—Persons Unconfirmed—Special Preachers Wanted—Addresses of Subscribers—Sermons Preached—Confirmation Class, &c. &c.

The Search for Franklin. A Narrative of the American Expedition under Lieutenant Schwatka, 1878 to 1880. Pp. 120. Nelson & Son.

A pleasing little gift book; well illustrated and very readable.

The Two Voyages; or, Morning and Daylight. By W. H. G. KINGSTON. Pp. 310. R. T. S.

The story of these "two voyages" shows what the natives were before and after the gospel was preached in the Islands of the Pacific. Interesting and informing, an attractive addition to any juvenile library, this book is tastefully got up, with gilt edges. It is a good companion to "The Golden Grasshopper," written by Mr. Kingston.

China as a Mission Field. By the Rev. A. E. MOULE, B.D. Pp. 74. C. M. House, Salisbury Square.

A readable pamphlet; with statistics clearly set forth, a good map and chronological table. May its appeal stir many hearts!

Cobwebs and Cables. By HESBA STRETTON, Author of "Jessica's First Prayer," &c. Pp. 364. The Religious Tract Society.

"Sins are at first like cobwebs, at last like cables:" this is the motto of the ably written and thoughtful tale before us.

From the Beginning. Stories from Genesis, for Little Children. By Mrs. G. E. MORTON, Author of "The Story of Jesus," &c. Pp. 230. Hatchards.

A year or two ago was commended in these columns Mrs. Morton's admirable book, "The Story of Jesus for Little Children." The volume before us is a worthy companion. Mrs. Morton has kept as much as possible to the words of the original: in arrangement and exposition she has shown reverent tact and skill. There are some illustrations and a map.

Beneath the Surface. Physical Truths, especially Geological, shown to be latent in many parts of the Holy Scriptures. By EDWARD DUKE, M.A., F.G.S. Pp. 275. Hatchards.

A thoughtful and truly reverent work.

Without a Reference. A Christmas Story. By BRENDA. Hatchards.

The author of "Froggy's Little Brothers," "Nothing to Nobody," and other well-known tales, is a pleasing and effective writer. Things were at a low ebb with John when his wife pawned his dress coat; but he and she were taught and trained in the surest school for many of us.

Precious Jewels for Daily Use. Arranged by Dr. E. J. WARING, pp. 365. Partridge & Co.

A small volume of short, suggestive, and sound meditations; it is printed in clear type.

Our Folks: John Churchill's Letters Home. By AGNES GIBERNE. *Hand and Heart* Publishing Office.

An amusing book, not without instruction. Our Bailiff, our Druggist, our Grocer, and so forth, are illustrated with pen and pencil.

The Lyon's Den, and its Eight Young Lyons. By Y. OSBORN, Author of "Jack," &c. Shaw & Co.

In the school-room of the Rev. William Lyon's house, one very wet afternoon, there was a very surprising calm. The cook and the one other servant of the household, who was housekeeper, nurse, housemaid, and general helper and director, wondering at this, resolved that an unwontedly early entrance with the tea was expedient. There were eight young Lyons in the den; what were they about? When the good old nurse entered, she raised her hands in dismay, and gave vent to a cry of wrath and reproach; for this is what she saw:—

A blazing fire in the July grate, so neatly adorned with shavings by her own hands during the summer months; eight apples reposing at intervals upon and between different bars, and eight young Lyons watching the progress of their cooking operations with more or less interest.

"Well, I never!" exclaimed nurse, wrathfully; "I felt sure you must be in mischief to keep as quiet as you have done, but I never would have looked for this!"

And so the talk goes on. There are grave and touching, as well as amusing, passages. The characters are well drawn; the tone is good, nor is the best of all things lacking. We cordially recommend this natural and very pleasing story. As a gift-book, it has a tasteful cover.

The Little Folks' Sunday Book. By CHRISTIAN REDFORD. Pp. 220. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.

Miss Redford has given us a very attractive and a very useful book. By experience, no doubt, as a Christian Worker, she has found out what style is suitable for little folks; and her subjects run upon "daily round and common task" lines. Her idea is capital; and she has worked it out well. A leading thought, with a chat upon it, text, verse of a hymn, prayer, &c., with two or three illustrative pictures.

Bible Light for Truth Seekers. Pp. 235. Haughton & Co.

This is the annual volume, apparently, of a cheap periodical. We have read some of the articles, *e.g.*, "The Fountain of Living Water," p. 202; "A Present Salvation," by the Rev. S. C. Morgan, and "Light in the Lord," p. 23: and we have found them sound and good.

Fun and Fairies. By GRACE STEBBING, Author of "Brave Geordie," "Silverdale Rectory," &c. John F. Shaw & Co.

Having a high opinion of "Silverdale Rectory," we were prepared to be pleased with the author's fairy tales, and we have not been disappointed. The "four little girls" were very happy, we make sure, to hear such deftly woven stories, and to see such pretty picture illustrations.

Russia, Past and Present. Adapted from the German of Lankenau and Oelnitz. By HENRIETTA M. CHESTER. With Map and Illustrations. Pp. 430. S. P. C. K.

This book supplies a want. It is full of interesting information, clear, and very readable. We may add that it is well printed.

Cassell's Old and New Edinburgh. Its History, its People, and its Places. By JAMES GRANT, Author of "Memorials of the Castle of Edinburgh," &c. Vol. I. Pp. 380. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.

We are greatly pleased with this work. It is full, readable, and trustworthy. There is an illustration on almost every page, so that the general reader has no difficulty in following the Author's lead; nor is he likely to find it tedious if he has any fondness for historical and antiquarian information. It is more than twenty years ago since the writer of this notice, in the company of a well-informed antiquarian, a connection of Sir Walter Scott, sought the many curious nooks and corners of the old town.

Every Boy's Annual. Edited by EDMUND ROUTLEDGE, F.R.G.S.
Every Girl's Annual. Edited by Miss ALICIA L. LEITH.
George Routledge & Sons.

Once more we have the pleasure of noticing these favourite yearly volumes of our boys and girls. The Annual for Boys, ably edited, contains stories and narratives of voyages and journeys of research, by well-known writers. "Adventures in Australia" was written by Mr. W. H. G. Kingston; the Rev. H. C. Adams has contributed "Travellers' Tales;" a paper by Colonel Drayson shows the pleasures and perils of Tiger Shooting. Several of the articles appear informing as well as interesting. The Annual for Girls seems as attractive, and is—a juvenile critic assures us—as good as usual. It contains a certain proportion of really useful matter. Both volumes are well illustrated, and some of the pictures are very pretty.

Little Wide Awake. An Illustrated Magazine for Good Children.
Edited by Mrs. SALE BARKER. George Routledge & Sons.

Glad, indeed, will be the "good children" to whom this handsome volume is presented. It contains charming coloured pictures; fairy tales (by Lord Brabourne); the memoirs of a terrier, with illustrations by Harrison Weir: odds and ends—grave and gay.

Among the volumes received by us too late for a worthy review-notice in the January CHURCHMAN (which is issued on an early day) is a splendid gift-book from Messrs. Cassell, Petter & Galpin, *The Holy Land.* This is a re-issue of an admirable work; the well-known drawings by Mr. ROBERTS, with descriptions by Dr. CROLY. Without delay we gladly invite attention to this edition; Division I. "Jerusalem and Galilee."

We observe, without surprise, that a second edition of the October *Quarterly Review* (Murray) has been called for. The article on the New Greek Text, to which we called attention in the November CHURCHMAN, has been read with interest in many a lay and clerical study in every part of the country. A friendly critic in the *John Bull*, when noticing our remarks upon it, hints that we have somewhat changed our mind in regard to the R. V. But our good friend in the *John Bull* is mistaken. The brilliant article in the *Quarterly*, written by one of the most eminent of our divines, to whose scholarship and dogmatic (and, let us add, Protestant) backbonism we gladly give honour, has not in the least modified our views of the value of the R. V. As to the volumes of Drs. WESTCOTT and HORT, we have expressed, as yet, no opinion. In the December *Contemporary Review*, Dr. Sanday, defending them, writes with literary skill and considerable power: it is an exceedingly interesting article. For our-

selves, while we agree to some extent with the "Conservative" dignitary in the *Quarterly Review*, we cannot refrain from paying a tribute of respect to the labours of thirty years.

We are much pleased with *Hilda*, a tale for girls, the motto of which is "Seeketh not her own," written by CATHARINE SHAW. Its lessons of fireside duties and the ministrations of home are pleasing, and likely to profit. "Hilda" was a doctor's wife, a devoted Christian. We may mention that *Nellie Arundel* and *In the Sunlight and Out of It*, are by the same author. (Messrs. J. F. Shaw & Co.)

The author of *Elsie Gordon, Rough the Terrier*, and other good stories, has written *Uncle Fred's Shilling, its Travels and Adventures* (J. F. Shaw & Co.), a capital gift-book for any boy or girl at this season. The story is amusing.

The Fireside for 1881 (*Home Words* Publishing Office) is as welcome as ever; a handsome volume, full of sound and readable articles. The enterprising editor, Mr. BULLOCK, has done much for the spread of pure and wholesome literature; whether he has been supported in anything like due measure we have some doubts. The *Fireside* and other useful Magazines, which for several years he has edited, are decidedly Evangelical on the lines of the Church of England. This Annual may be recommended with fullest confidence.

One of the R. T. S. large type series, *Old Blind Ned; or, The Lord will Provide*; *The Oldest of Seven*, a shilling smaller size volume; *Two of England's Wars; or, Theodore and Coffee, and Abyssinia and Ashantee;* and *The Children's King*, "stories for the little ones;" we have great pleasure in commending. The last named, a gilt-edged volume, has a very tasteful cover. All are bright, illustrated, and good.

We have pleasure in recommending *Only a Tramp*, uniform with that well written story, "Silverdale Rectory," also by GRACE STEBBING (J. F. Shaw & Co.) Many boys and girls will be glad to hear again of Mr. Charles Wynn, the Tramp.

We can thoroughly recommend the *Day of Days Annual* (1, Paternoster Buildings, E.C.), a magazine for Sunday reading, edited by the Rev. C. BULLOCK, B.D. Among the illustrations we notice one of Mr. Eugene Stock, with a very interesting biographical sketch.

A Lighthouse Keeper, The Two Brothers, The Little Australian Girl. (Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier), are simple stories with winsome bits of Scotch; very cheap, with a pretty cover.

We have received the volume for 1881 of *Cassell's Family Magazine* (Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.), a handsomely bound, well illustrated gift-book for Christmas and the New Year. The stories, a friend tells us, are well written: and the songs are of a high class. With the papers which we ourselves have read we are much pleased. The Household Papers, *e.g.*, are exceedingly good: practical hints, sound, sensible advice in small compass. Under the head of "The Gatherer," many paragraphs are interesting and informing. The *Family Magazine* for week-day reading, and the *Quiver* for the sacred day of rest, are ably edited and useful magazines.

Parish of ——. *Parochial Offertory*, A.D. 1882. Published by the S. P. C. K. An admirable idea: just the thing for Vestry use.

From Messrs. T. & T. Clark, the eminent Edinburgh publishers, we have received Dr. HUTHER'S *Commentary on the Epp. of Peter and Jude;* also his work on the Pastoral Epistles (German, fourth edition). We have received the third volume of *Hagenbach's History of Doctrines*, and the first volume of Bishop MARTENSEN'S *Christian Ethics:* the second issue for the present year of "Clark's Foreign Theological Library."

From Mr. Stock (62, Paternoster Row) we have received the concluding

volume of *The Biblical Museum*, vol. x., of the Old Testament, "Daniel and the Minor Prophets." Mr. GRAY'S comprehensive work—fifteen volumes—which, so far as we know, is unique, has more than once been recommended in these columns; it is a store-house—really a *Museum*—of hints and illustrations, a practical, "popular" Commentary.

We have much pleasure in recommending *The Wonderland of Work.* (Cassell), by C. L. MATÉAUX. An excellent book for boys: knives, whips,, clocks, leather, gloves, chains, and so forth. There are many wood-cuts, small and large. So good a book of the kind we have never seen.

The charming Cards for Christmas and New Year, published by Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode, Her Majesty's Printers (Great New Street, E.C.), were warmly commended in the CHURCHMAN last year. Their issue for this season is perhaps rather better; and this is saying a great deal. In looking over the series of specimens, one's difficulty is to apportion praise. There are many varieties, new and old; all are choice and good, and many are exquisite art-productions. Those from designs of their own special artists, Mr. E. Maurice, Mr. H. Arnold, and Miss Steel, deserve the highest praise.

Messrs. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co. have published a "popular edition" of Dr. FARRAR'S *Life of Christ*: a handy volume (460 pages) well printed, and well got up.

Peter Parley's Annual for 1882, with numerous illustrations and coloured plates (Cassell). "*The 41st year!*" Such a book has a reputation. We well remember, a good many years ago it is now, prizing a "Peter Parley" very highly for leisure half-hours. Of late years we have not seen our old friend. Doubtless in the hands of its present proprietors the *Annual* will flourish. The stories are very good.

Messrs R. & A. Suttaby (Amen Corner, Paternoster Row) have sent us their *Christmas Remembrancer* for 1882: an excellent pocket-book.

Chatterbox for 1881 (Wells Gardner, Darton & Co.) is, as usual, bright and usual; a capital gift-volume.

Peter Trawl; or, The Adventures of a Whaler, is one of the best of the good stories written by the late Mr. KINGSTON (Hodder & Stoughton).

We have received from Messrs. Seeley, Jackson, & Halliday, too late for fitting notice in the present number, *Benvenuta*, a tale by that able and admirable story-writer, Mrs. MARSHALL: *Under the Shield*, a story by the author of that excellent book, "The Nest of Sparrows:" *The World's Foundations; or, Geology for Beginners*, by AGNES GIBERNE, whose "Sun, Moon, and Stars," a charming book of Astronomy for beginners (also published by Messrs Seeley) was warmly recommended in THE CHURCHMAN a year ago; it is an attractive volume, with coloured illustrations. From the same firm we have received *Chirps for the Chicks*, a delightful book for little folks, by M. E. WINCHESTER, Author of "A Nest of Sparrows." The opening lines are:—

> Sing a song of sixpence,
> A pocket full of rye,

and the old, old nursery favourites follow in due order. *Chirps for the Chicks* is, in fact, very nearly at the head of children's books this season. There are thirty capital illustrations.

We have received a selection of the Cards published by Messrs. Marcus Ward & Co. for the season of 1881–2. Those we received from this firm last year were exceedingly good. The issue for the present season is even better.

THE RELIGIOUS CENSUS.

AT the Liverpool Diocesan Conference, a paper—which the *Liverpool Daily Post* rightly terms an exceedingly able paper—was read by Archdeacon Bardsley.[1] The subject was "The Spiritual Wants of the Large Parishes." The Ven. the Archdeacon said:—

Since this subject was first selected for our deliberations, many questions affecting our large parishes have been made painfully prominent, and the inquiry has been raised, with startling emphasis, as to what extent the existing means of grace in our large parishes are being fully utilized. The Liverpool census of Sunday worship is being repeated in all our large towns, and the whole community anxiously waits for words of adequate explanation, if the statistics be not correct, or if, alas! substantially true, for some suggestions of remedial measures.

First, let us inquire what are the facts in reference to the spiritual condition of our large parishes—large parishes, that is to say, in numbers as well as area. Three millions only of the English people were found in towns at the beginning of this century, but of the twenty-six millions which the recent census records, 17¼ millions are dwellers in towns as opposed to 8½ millions in the country districts—that is to say, the urban is to the rural population as two to one. Whilst, moreover, these 8½ millions are distributed in 10,500 parishes, with endowments amounting to £2,700,000 per annum, the 17¼ millions of townspeople are distributed in 3,000 parishes only, and possess not more in the way of religious endowments than 1*s.* per head of their entire population. The present Dean of Lichfield has, from returns laid before the Southern Convocation, felt justified in saying that 5,000,000 of these dwellers in our large parishes have never, either from the mouth of the clergy or from others, had the blessed tidings of salvation through Christ brought directly home to them.

* * * * * *

Whilst the vigorous tones of our Bishop still linger in our ears, as in his first Charge he lamented the lack of spiritual appliances for dealing with these great multitudes—only 200 incumbents and 140 curates—we are startled and alarmed by statistics published in the *Liverpool Daily Post*, and by returns rapidly coming in from all the other large towns of the diocese, which seem to show that the multitudes are availing themselves of the means of grace in a smaller degree even than in the past, and that the facilities furnished for public worship are largely in excess of the amount required. The religious census made in Liverpool at the instance of the late Mr. Nathaniel Caine, in 1853, gave the following results:—58 churches, 63,279 seats, and 34,593 worshippers at one service. The census taken on Sunday

[1] No report of this Paper, so far as we know, has appeared in the metropolitan journals. At our request the Archdeacon kindly sent us a copy; but we did not receive it till the December CHURCHMAN was printed. The Conference seems to have been a great success.

morning of October 16 last, however, shows 73 churches, 73,663 seats, and 23,193 worshippers; that is to say, whilst our churches have increased 25 per cent. and our seats 10 per cent., the actual number of worshippers have decreased by 33 per cent.

* * * * * *

As yet, we seem only to have touched individuals, not to have influenced the masses. These are they among whom the Salvation Army wins recruits; these are they who crowd the evangelistic services of our circuses and theatres. The fields are truly white with harvest. If we put forth the sickle we shall reap a great harvest; if we neglect them, the very crop that spiritually rots on the ground will, by its corrupt condition, become the instrument to scourge our sinful indifference. If the Church which is responsible will not rear her barns and will restrain her sickle, how shall she complain when earnest, though irregular workers seek, even beneath the frail shelter of four bare poles and a mere tarpaulin, to house and secure the golden grain! Surely, if the Established Church is to be indeed the Church of the people, not only at the polling booths and by general expressions of hearty goodwill, but by winning the multitude for the Master, she must rouse herself afresh, and by new methods adapt herself to the changed circumstances of the times. If statesmen in a recent emergency have shown that "resources of civilization" were in reserve, our dear Church must prove that, to deal with the great problem of our large parishes, the resources of her spiritual warfare are as yet not exhausted.

* * * * * *

I proceed next to suggest some plans which, by God's blessing, would, if carried out, do much to meet the spiritual wants of our large parishes. The first two suggestions come under the head of rearrangement, and have reference to the utilizing in a higher degree our present resources in men and material. . . . . Thirdly, we want, if the lost and waste ground is to be quickly and effectually reclaimed, a much larger measure of lay help. . . . . Fourthly, we want, if we are effectually to cope with the spiritual wants of our large parishes, more freedom and variety in our services. The poor want "teaching which they can understand, and sermons which they can grasp; services which they can follow, and music which they can sing."

On Nov. 27, Canon Blakeney, the Vicar of Sheffield, preached in the Parish Church on Christian work throughout the country, making an especial reference to the recent startling statistics as to public worship. Having shown how few people engage in the work of God, the honoured Vicar said:—

The late religious census which has been taken in Sheffield reveals to us a state of things for which many were not prepared. It would appear from the statement which has been published, that out of a population of about 285,000, only one person in every five-and-a-half of that number attended service in some place of worship last Sunday evening; or, as it has been calculated, one in three and three-tenths of those who might have attended if they had the will, that is, fifty-

eight in every hundred of the population. I think, however, this is somewhat in excess of the number who could avail themselves of public worship, for we must not forget that a large proportion of the population are incapacitated from attendance either at church or chapel. There are the great mass of infants and children of tender years; there are the aged, the sick, and the dying, and those who wait upon them; there are the hundreds of respectable poor who are deterred from mixing with their more fortunate neighbours on account of their shabby clothing; there are the multitudes of working women who have to tend and nurse their children, as well as prepare their husband's meals, which may be the only comfortable meals they can get during the week; there are hotel-keepers and their servants, domestic servants, railway porters and officials, post-office employés, policemen, cabmen, night watchmen, caretakers of houses, and many others that could be mentioned, all of whom may be fairly struck out of the list of those who can attend public worship. I think, if a careful inquiry were made, that Mr. Horace Mann's figures would be found to be in excess of the number which he has given in his calculations. Still, it is most distressing to think that there are hundreds and thousands who never darken the door of any place of worship whatever, and I think that it is time for the Christian Church to inquire carefully and prayerfully into this matter, and see what are the real causes of this state of things. For upwards of twenty-one years I have seen as much of working people as most men, and my experience leads me to believe that some of the causes which make them appear to sit so loosely to all religion are:—Firstly. The neglect of the Christian Church in the past. Secondly. The rapid growth of the population. Thirdly. The unseemly contentions between church and chapel, and chapel and church, and the disgraceful dissensions which often spring up among congregations. Fourthly. The frightful inconsistencies and declensions of those who make a profession of religion, and are often leading members in both church and chapel; for, alas! Christianity is more frequently read in the character and conduct of the professing Christian than in the Bible or Christ Himself. I could now speak in expansion of these causes, but I have not time. I hope to take them again on some other occasion. Many working men, and others, have been led to feel that all religion is a sham by what they often witness in the conduct of those who ought to be an example to them of holy living. I am afraid that this sad state of things will continue until we put from us all jealousy, envy, evil speaking, uncharitableness, unholy living, and unseemly contentions between the sects, and rise to a real sense of our duties and responsibilities before God, as a people professing to be followers of Christ. The world outside is quick-sighted in detecting any flaw which may be in our characters, and is influenced by it. The census which has just been taken ought to have a very humbling effect upon us all, and I trust will stimulate us to more prayerful efforts in advancing the cause of our Divine Master. And here I am bound to say that we shall be doing a grievous injustice to the great mass of those who attend no place of worship were we to conclude that they all were either atheists or sceptics. I believe if a house-to-house canvass were taken, there are

very few who would not feel themselves insulted were they to be classified among unbelievers. The great bulk of them would declare themselves as belonging to some Christian society. A year or two before I left St. Paul's, I had a careful census taken of all that resided in the parish, and it was remarkable how few returned themselves as belonging to no religious sect. Nearly 70 per cent. of the people declared themselves to be members of the Church of England. I have good reason to hope, if a similar census were taken, in the same way, in the other parishes of the town, that a similar result would be arrived at. I am often grieved and shocked by the way in which the working classes, who do not habitually attend places of worship, are sometimes spoken of—they are represented as being sceptics or infidels of various kinds, but I deny that such is the case. I have had great experience among them, and have attended hundreds, and indeed I may say thousands, on their sick and dying beds. I have been with them when hypocrisy was impossible. I have then heard from their own lips their real confession of faith, and witnessed their trust in God's love and mercy through a crucified Saviour. Most of them desire the ministrations of the clergy, and would shrink with horror from the idea of being buried without any Christian service. The very men who are often classified among those who look with contempt on all religion, have been taken *en masse* in the great works of the town, during the Missions that have been held when our revered Archbishop and others have addressed them, and it was most gratifying to witness the respectful attention with which they listened to the addresses. Many will remember the great meeting of working men held in the Albert Hall during the last mission, and the meeting which took place during the Church Congress. It did one's heart good to witness these magnificent sights, and to hear the songs of praise which ascended from these vast assemblies, the bulk of whom I believe are seldom seen in church or chapel. In order to get them to become active members of the Christian Church, we must first be united among ourselves, and then exhibit a kind, loving, Christian spirit in all that we do or say. And now a word about the attendance at this church. It is a cause of much thankfulness to me to witness the large numbers, especially of working people, who regularly worship here. Last Sunday was no exception to the rule, in fact the church is often more crowded in the evening than it was on that occasion; but while the morning and afternoon attendances are most encouraging, I should like to see them as much appreciated as that in the evening. I am afraid there is a growing tendency among all classes to be content with attending only one service in the day. Many thereby rob themselves of much profit and blessing. I do trust, however, that the day is not far distant when we shall see this great church filled from end to end with a devout and attentive congregation at all our services. All classes are welcome, and by the arrangements which are made the church is free and open to the public. My heart's desire and prayer to Almighty God is that He may bow the heavens and come down among us in all His power; and rouse the sleeping Church to a sense of her privileges and duties, that a great revival of true and saving religion may spring up, and that the Kingdom of Christ may be extended in our midst.