---

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

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

THE

# CHURCHMAN

JUNE, 1882.

## ART. I.—LAY WORK ON THE SEAS.

FOR thirty years, special prayer has ascended every Sunday morning, from a united band of naval officers, for the outpouring of God's Spirit on all belonging to, or connected with, the naval service. From every clime, and from every sea, on shore or afloat, between the hours of seven and eleven on Sundays, since 1851, have the spiritual wants of the navy been thus particularly brought before the Throne of Grace. This union in prayer for the promotion of religion in Her Majesty's fleet, originated with one of the greatest of Arctic navigators, that splendid seaman, the late Admiral Sir W. Edward Parry. So long as British enterprise finds a place in history, as scientific geography finds intelligent students, and as records of peril and adventure thrill the mind, will the discoveries and daring of the great Arctic pioneer of this century be a rich inheritance to all educated Englishmen. But from the beginning to the end of his naval career, Parry was before all things a courageous Christian. Thirty years since, when the great sea captain was nearing his flag, he wrote to the present writer, God has said, "them that honour Me I will honour," and this had been the experience of his own life.

Though there were but forty-four names of naval officers attached to the first edition of the Union in Prayer, many others, to whom it became known, gladly embraced the idea. It is interesting to note thence the more obvious of the replies received by seamen. In 1851, Sir Edward Parry, looking back at his own period afloat, was able to say:—

> That a very decided change has taken place of late years, not only in the physical, but also in the moral aspect of the navy, none who are acquainted with our service will entertain a doubt. Recognizing

in this fact the gracious interposition of God in behalf of the long-degraded and spiritually destitute sailor, it appears to suggest the duty of uniting in a humble and prayerful effort to improve the religious character of our seamen. We desire, therefore, to engage the cordial co-operation of all (whether belonging to the navy or not) who know the value of united prayer; in order that the hands of our Christian friends afloat may be strengthened, and that an increasing number of those who "do business on the waters" may, by God's blessing, be brought to a knowledge of "the truth as it is in Jesus."

After thirty years' intercessory prayer, it is very remarkable to note the great changes in the spiritual character of men at sea. Whatever of religious instruction and devout example seamen had received, came chiefly from their own officers, or from their comrades. Shoregoing clergymen rarely ministered on board ships in harbour. Indeed, sailors are not always, when in port, in such a fit frame of mind to receive religious instruction as they are when at sea. Few of H.M.'s ships carried chaplains, and the moral condition of the crews varied very much, according to the character and religious activities of their officers. There was much in the naval system of those days hostile to personal piety, and actively promotive, whether intentionally so or not, of vice and immorality.

On the one hand, the officers were commanded to conduct Sunday morning worship; libraries were supplied, but not always issued; schoolmasters were appointed, but not generally employed. .But on the other, the system of payment in vogue, and the evil traditions of social life, almost necessitated degrading and unblushing profligacy.

At the outbreak of the Russian war, a large increase took place in the number of naval chaplains. Still, at least three-fourths of the Queen's ships were never visited by clergymen, and their crews remained dependent from boyhood for worship and teaching, on their officers, themselves brought up at sea away from ministerial instruction. Subsequently, very short daily morning prayers for the whole crew, occupying from five to ten minutes, were introduced by certain officers; and in some of the ships bearing chaplains. This ancient custom of the sea was thus gradually revived, till it became so general that, in 1860 we believe, an Admiralty order was issued to the whole fleet converting the custom into a commanded observance. About this period, Sunday afternoon or evening services sprang up, now in this ship, now in that. One of the sternest disciplinarians of our time, being then in command of the Mediterranean Fleet, forbade the then customary evolutions aloft on Sundays, and the inane practice of commencing the Lord's Day, from 4 A.M. till 10 A.M., by so-called washing decks, &c. Ships of war are usually made as clean as a new pin, from

the truck to the keelson, by Saturday night. The process of splashing the vessel all over with salt water on Sunday morning before daylight, and then repairing the mischief by polishing the vessel afresh, is an absurd, unnecessary and worrying habit, which we regret to say is not yet quite extinguished.

Nevertheless, the official worship did not touch the hearts of as many of the crews as might have been expected. Indeed, it is not too much to say that many of the officers who conducted it had no idea that it should do so. It was part of the pomp and circumstance of official state, a naval parade. Attendance was nowhere more rigidly enforced than by officers who could not admit that the will, the conscience, the heart, had any part in this, to them, piece of naval routine. Compulsory worship was regarded as a thing quite apart from spontaneously attended services. Still, it was something to have the wood laid in order, and the coals in place ready when the Holy Ghost applied the light. And whatever the intention of the officiating laymen, God's Word could not be daily read, however carelessly, in the ears of the crews, without the Spirit of God blessing it to individual souls. Known only to God were the hearts in which the holy words of united prayer, thoughtlessly uttered by the officers, were solemnly winged to heaven by devout members of their congregations.

In 1856, the year after the founder of the Naval Prayer Union was received into the Courts above, some of its original members were amongst the foremost in founding the Society for Missions to Seamen Afloat. It was intended to promote the spiritual welfare of the seafaring classes at home and abroad, by every means consistent with the principles and received practice of the Church of England, in contradistinction to the many nonconformist organizations then existing for the improvement of seamen. Most of the nonconformist, or, as some wish to be called, nonsectarian, agencies had confined their attention to the very greatly neglected merchant seamen; but the Missions to Seamen was designed to care also for the Royal Navy, for fishermen, and for emigrants. Nevertheless, the utter neglect of religious worship, public and private, and the entire absence of chaplains from the vast British merchant fleets, naturally taxed most of the energies of the Missions to Seamen at this period. Yet the example its chaplains set of itinerant ministrations from ship to ship, of mixing freely amongst the crews, and of being the personal friends of individual seamen, gave a wholly new idea to many even religious naval officers, as to the way hearts were to be won for Christ, and souls brought by the Holy Spirit to the foot of the cross.

Still, towards the end of the first decade of weekly intercessory prayer, the moral outlook was not cheering. The Royal

navy had been flooded with "bounty men," many of whom were the dregs of the mercantile marine. Drunkenness was sadly prevalent; leave breaking, which usually means vile profligacy, was common; hospitals were filled with the victims of immorality; petty crime had greatly increased; and a low moral condition generally obtained. The ninety crews then provided with naval chaplains were just as vicious as the three times more numerous ones dependent on lay ministrations; and the old complaint seemed justified, "that the former days were better than these." Such answers to intercessory prayer might well have been disheartening. But the promoters of the Weekly Prayer Union were not discouraged. They chose this dark period to invite their brother officers to join with them in their Sunday morning intercessions. In 1859, 145 naval and marine officers of all commissioned ranks gave in their names as intending to offer up weekly prayer for the navy. Many other officers and men took up this intercessory practice, and henceforth a very remarkable moral and spiritual change was wrought by various agencies in Her Majesty's sea service.

The men-of-war's men of to-day are a much more staid, thoughtful, and respectable body of men than in 1859; their social habits are far superior to landsmen of the same rank; and the hold which vital godliness has on their lives and their future hopes is far more general than amongst people on shore. The naval authorities no longer assume an attitude of hostility towards really spiritual agencies. The customs of the service are not now in league with vice. The office of the Holy Ghost in the daily worship is not so entirely forgotten. The object of worshipping the Eternal God and Father of all, is not generally degraded into a mere naval parade. There is a reaching after holier and higher gifts of God. And to the spiritually minded man who can discern spiritual things, there is an evident work of the Spirit going on in Her Majesty's fleet. The change of character and conduct is evident in the medical and police reports, as well as in the streets and resorts of seaport towns. It is seen in some men-of-war's men and marines kneeling daily in private prayer in their mess-places and barrack rooms, in the communicant's classes, and adult schools, not only on board ship but when on shore. One man-of-war's man in every six is a total abstainer. Communions and communicants afloat have increased, though not in proportion to other symptoms. There is a more general participation in the voluntarily attended services on board, and, where churchwardens permit it, in the various means of grace in churches on land. This great and general religious movement in Her Majesty's fleet is a matter, not of opinion, but of observed fact.

Many agencies have been at work to promote these great

changes. The mode of paying wages, which was at the bottom of much profligacy, has been so amended as to no longer necessitate vice; but as to render family life possible to the sailor.[1] Training ships have been inaugurated and well worked out. Continuous service has replaced intermittent and precarious employment, and has done much to make the means of livelihood constant and certain. A system of rewards for good conduct and for extra-professional attainments has replaced mere repression and the lash. Frequent leave to go on shore has familiarized men-of-war's men with the land, and taught them how to avoid its dangers. Leave-breaking with its hideous profligacy, though far too prevalent, is condemned by the public opinion of shipmates. Teetotalism advances rapidly. A thousand foremast seamen are active workers in the temperance cause. The question whether spirits should be introduced into the Sailor's Home at Portsmouth was recently put to "the vote" and negatived by a large majority of the men-of-war's men at that port. Those who would understand the details of ship life should read "A Seaman's Life on Board a Man-of-War," Griffin & Co., Portsea. Price *6d.* It is perhaps rather *couleur de rose,* but it enters into many particulars showing the care taken of men-of-war's men in body, mind, and soul; and how superior they are physically, intellectually, and morally to landsmen of the same social grade. The organizations emanating from the Admiralty have all, of late years, been against vice, and in favour of virtue. Indeed, it is due to the Admiralty to acknowledge that their lordships now keep a good deal in advance of the officers serving afloat, in desire to promote truly religious and virtuous practices. Probably few of the naval authorities who took part in these changes of system had anything else in view than an enlightened and far-seeing desire for the benefit of Her Majesty's service. Possibly they knew not of the Weekly Union in Prayer for the Royal Navy; or if they had known of it, they would hardly have traced any connection between it and their own actions. But God works by various instruments and in many ways.

One direct and evident result of the revival of the Weekly Union in Prayer for Her Majesty's Navy in 1859, was the opening by some of its members, of a Tuesday evening prayer meeting for naval chaplains, officers, seamen and marines in the Devonport Sailor's Home. This was started on the first Tuesday of 1860, under the presidency of the late Rev. W. R. Payne, M.A., R.N., then chaplain to the Royal Naval Hospital at that port.

[1] The number of immoral women has been greatly reduced. Even ladies can now walk the streets of Portsmouth and Devonport without seeing or hearing anything offensive.

The meeting continued with varying numbers for five years. Ere six months, however, there sprang out of it a Royal Naval Scripture Readers' Society, based on Church of England lines. This was then the almost sole representative of the volunteer element in religion on board the Queen's ships. It was conducted solely by naval chaplains and naval officers, and was the first instance, we believe, in which chaplains serving afloat were induced to unite for the general good of seamen, outside of their individual ships. Laymen had heretofore been mainly conspicuous in promoting united efforts to advance God's kingdom in the navy; but here were chaplains on full pay quitting their isolation, and uniting with one another and with laymen, to promote the glory of God and the general good of souls on the seas. The Scripture Readers supplemented the labours of chaplains in the larger ships by an individualizing ministry, hitherto practised by few of the naval clergy; whilst they aided the officers in the other two-thirds of the fleet to make amends for the entire absence of clerical ministrations on board their vessels.

Such a movement, springing from within the navy, and conducted exclusively by its chaplains and officers, naturally excited, in so conservative a service, much opposition. It represented voluntaryism as the spiritual outcome of officialism in naval religion. It was not antagonistic to the existing public worship; but, in a truly conservative spirit, the Royal Naval Scripture Readers' Society sought to make the worship more life-giving, more real. It fostered and nourished the spiritual outcome of the recognized services, the work of the Holy Spirit in the individual soul. Its agents no sooner appeared, Bible in hand, amongst the messes, than godly seamen, converted under the official services, appeared here and there amongst the hundreds forming the crews. These holy seamen had not heretofore been known in that capacity to one another, to their chaplain (if the ship had any), nor even to the more devout officers. Seamen associating in the same ship, or even in the same mess, are often utter strangers to one another as to their religious cravings or spiritual experiences. An outsider introducing messmates to one another as Christian brethren, found the nucleus of a permanent Bible class already on board, with a resident teacher ready to hand, only awaiting his touch to call it into being. The light was already there, but it was hidden under a bushel, and the Reader placed it on a candlestick. The effect on large crews, of unsuspected companions witnessing for Christ by joining Bible classes, &c., was remarkable. These voluntarily attended meetings or classes spread from ship to ship, so that a prize was given for the best essay on "Bible Classes in the Navy," which was published in

1870.[1] It is quite true that, here and there, such voluntarily attended meetings had been held in this ship-of-war and in that within living memory. But that which was infrequent before now became general. We had ourselves previously served in a frigate without a chaplain, in which a prayer-meeting was held every evening for five years (1852–7). Whether off Cape Horn or in Bhering Straits, within the tropics or in the temperate zones, in a gale or in calm, at sea or in port, in the Atlantic or in the Pacific oceans, this little prayer-meeting, varying from two to twenty in number, met regularly every evening in the gunner's cabin. On Sunday afternoons the Evening Service was said in the same place. This was, of course, besides the one Sunday service conducted for the whole crew of 250 men by the captain. Only once in the course of those five years was, as the good gunner wrote, that little prayer-meeting "honoured by the presence of a clergyman." What a responsibility rested, then, on that gunner, as the only teacher of that small band, and through them of their 250 shipmates! And he himself, what knowledge could he, who had spent his whole life from boyhood on board ship, have of theology for such a responsible office? He stuck, however, to his Bible and Prayer Book, with a copy of Wesley's Commentary and of Wesley's Hymns, as the main part of his theological library. He thus kept himself and his little band straight on the rails.

In the course of the second decade of the Weekly Prayer Union for the Navy, a great change took place as to private prayer. It required the courage of a Daniel to kneel night and morning in the presence of several hundred shipmates, in ordinary daily private prayer. There were, it is true, a few men and boys, like young Charles Parry,[2] when a midshipman, in 1851, who dared to do so; but, practically, kneeling in private prayer was regarded as impossible. Even for years after daily public prayer was revived, kneeling, either in private or in public prayer, was still regarded as an offence against public opinion. Many consciences were cruelly burdened by the sense that they were not honouring God in this matter, and that their not doing so was in deference to worldly companions. Prayer in the hammock after a hard night watch, with a prospect of having soon to turn out again, was apt to be very brief, and often to be forgotten altogether. In 1870, a private letter sympathizing with them in this difficulty was lithographed in *facsimile*, and sent to each of the 700 or 800 young officers in the gun-room. It suggested that what

[1] "Bible Classes in the Navy." Royal Naval Scripture Readers' Society, 4, Trafalgar Square, London, W.C. Price 6*d*.

[2] See "Memorials of Commander Charles Parry, R.N." Hatchards & Co. Price 3*s*. 6*d*.

was pressing on the conscience of the recipient of the note, equally pressed on the minds of others of his messmates; and he was advised to speak privately in a night watch to one of them, and to arrange to kneel simultaneously in private prayer morning and evening. The advice was in many instances taken, and the *Britannia* did the rest. At the same time, it was suggested to the commanding officers of the boys' training ships that the bugle should sound the "Still," night and morning, for two minutes of silence and cessation of movement. In this interval all were at liberty to kneel in silent prayer, but nobody was to be compelled to do so. The practice once started, met a felt need, and soon spread to the sea-going ships. We hope that there is not now a ship-of-war in which knees do not bow daily without encountering intolerable social persecution. The silent influence of a few seamen kneeling quietly in morning and evening prayer, in the presence of their comrades, has been known to alter the whole tone, language, and conduct of a large ship's company. To help these young men to live a life of prayer, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has recently published "The Book of Private Prayer for Seamen and Marines Afloat." We cannot say that we are fond of religious books specially written for sailors. They are generally weak productions all round—weak in literary ability, and still weaker in theology, with an offensive jargon which passes amongst landsmen for nautical language. But though "The Book of Private Prayer" bristles with nauticalities, it does do so necessarily, and therefore not offensively. Of its ability, fervour, and spirituality there can be no question. The prayers are beautiful adaptations of the Church's collects to the various exigencies of individual life. Our only qualm about the book is that, seeing it is written for sailors so much dependent on lay teaching, it somewhat strangely refers the anxious inquirer throughout to a clergyman. Whilst considering how rare are the opportunities which seamen have of receiving the Lord's Supper, it gives rather much prominence to an ordinance which seamen can seldom obtain. A sailor pronouncing upon the theology of a S. P. C. K. book would be rather out of place, but it does seem to us a little stiff.

The religious activities developed in Her Majesty's fleet during the last thirty years gives special importance to the kind of guidance and instruction under which anxious souls fall. The number of sea-going ships carrying chaplains has decreased to forty-three, and the services of these clergymen are rarely extended to the five times more numerous vessels flying pennants, including coastguard cruisers, which do not bear chaplains. Indeed, even the royal yachts, manned by some two hundred men, are never visited by clergymen. Thus, it is upon laymen that the great majority of the crews are dependent for worship and teaching.

Happily, though the number of naval chaplains has decreased, their usefulness has been increased by the removal of senseless obstructions. Thus they have, within the period under review, been authorized to visit sick and dying men on board, a privilege or duty often previously denied to them. They can now also administer the Holy Communion at least once a month. This, however, is generally done privately in the captain's cabin, where foremast seamen cannot attend, or in some hole-and-corner part of the ship, other than the place where public "prayer is wont to be made." Consequently, few sailors avail themselves of the chaplain's services as to this holy ordinance, although they frequently show their sense of its value by administering it to one another. The rite of confirmation is now encouraged, whereas, as recently as 1860, the chaplains of the Channel squadron were forbidden to invite a bishop to administer it. The setting apart of a screened place for religious gatherings during the evening hours, at the request of the men and on the recomendation of the chaplain, is recognized by the Admiralty since 1870. The issuing of the books from the ship's library has also been relegated to the chaplain's care, affording a valuable opportunity for speaking individually to the men. Tracts, the issue of which were formerly forbidden, are now not only allowed, but even supplied. Prayer books and hymn books, so essential for the joint participation of the crew in public worship, are now furnished in adequate numbers. In these and other ways, the naval chaplain is much less untrammelled, and can therefore be much more useful to the crew of his own ship than he was permitted to be thirty years ago. Moreover, the regular return of men-of-war's men and marines to the depôt ships and barracks for some months—after periods of three or four years' service at sea—brings them periodically under the influence and teachings of the forty-six stationary chaplains. And we can confidently affirm that the weekly prayer for the navy has been and is being answered, that "Grace may be given to our chaplains to be wise, faithful, and diligent servants of Christ; and that the Spirit of God may abundantly bless their labours, to the awakening and establishing of many souls." Still, even whilst in these harbour ships, the seamen often derive much religious instruction from laymen and from certain ladies who take a prominent part both in public worship and teaching on shore at the principal naval ports.

It not unnaturally occurred about ten years ago to some naval men, chaplains, and others, that it might be advantageous to establish in the navy, as a bond of union and communion amongst the more devout officers and men, a society for purposes of mutual prayer and Christian fellowship. This took shape in the form of the Naval Church Society, at Portsmouth,

which includes "officers, men and boys who are baptized members of the Church of Christ." By the annual publication of the names of its members, the society supplies, in the ceaseless changes of nautical life, a means of mutual recognition between pious officers and men meeting in all parts of the world. It has lately published a prize essay on "Lay Work in the Royal Navy,"[1] which treats of the organization, instruction and training of volunteer lay teachers in that service. The essayist takes a strong stand on evangelical principles, which he defines to be synonymous with Scriptural ones; and claims for the Church of England, that as it honours and uses Scripture more than any other church, it is therefore the most truly evangelical.[2] He, however, points out—

> That four men and boys in every hundred in the Royal Navy are Presbyterians, and that the numerous dissenting denominations, between them, all together, supply 9·4 per cent.; whilst the Roman Catholics number twelve in every hundred. . . . . It should be the part of the 74·6 per cent. baptized in the Church of England, as the vast majority on board, to pay due deference and respect to the various religious convictions of the minority.

The essayist gives a sad picture of certain very earnest officers and men who, adopting a creedless, shifting, and self-asserting religion, in which every one adopts what is right in his own eyes, have fallen away from Scripture truth, by leaning too much on their own imaginations. He ascribes their fall to a reaction from the perfunctory way divine worship is too often conducted, and which disgusts earnest men with the Church of England services, which they wrongly assume to be at fault. Taking to themselves various names, such as non-sectarians, brethren, &c., they set themselves against all ministerial teaching, whether of clergymen or scripture-readers, and look on human knowledge as opposed to the Spirit's work. With an overweening conceit in their own infallibility, and giving fanciful interpretations to special texts, they cast aside this portion of Scripture and that, as the "inner light" suggests, till at last the greater part of the Bible is thrown overboard. Thence, discarding Christ in several of His offices, and the continuous sanctification of the Holy Ghost, they are led from one degree of unbelief to another, until by various stages they drift

---

[1] "Lay Work in the Royal Navy." Griffin & Co., Portsea. Price 2*d.*

[2] In his hot zeal for the whole Word of God being the Rule of Faith, the essayist has been obviously misled by the title of "Church Doctrine, Bible Truth," into suggesting it amongst the books for a lay teacher's library. The strong Evangelical tone of the whole essay on "Lay Work in the Royal Navy," shows that the writer could not have known anything of the book thus included in the list.

into infidelity. It is to save those who are thus drifting from the secure moorings of the Word of God that the essayist strongly pleads that lay teachers should themselves be taught, and should not be left to devise theological systems each out of his own uninstructed brain. Many of the thousand foremast seamen who are actively working the temperance cause are also religious leaders, and they are by no means the only laymen looked up to by their comrades for interpreting and expounding Holy Scripture. Ways are suggested by which the services of the chaplains might be utilized for the instruction and training of these devout laymen, the better to fit them for their highly responsible teaching duties. The spiritual oversight of naval chaplains might also be usefully extended to the numerous vessels of war, on board which clergymen very seldom officiate. As this essay has been selected for the prize by three experienced naval chaplains and two officers serving afloat, in competition with fourteen others which have been all deemed worthy of publication, "Lay Work in the Royal Navy" comes before the public with an *imprimatur* which makes some amends for its otherwise anonymous character.

We have left ourselves little space to refer to "Lay Work in the Merchant Navy,"[1] on which the Missions to Seamen Society has published a prize essay. However, the subject has already been referred to in the article on "Missions to Merchant Seamen," signed by the late Admiral W. A. Baillie Hamilton, which appeared in THE CHURCHMAN, for August, 1881. Encouragement, sympathy, instruction, and guidance are even more needed by lay workers for God in the mercantile marine than in the Royal Navy. There are over 38,000 vessels flying the British red ensign, which ought to carry 38,000 Christian congregations, and at least that number of officiating lay workers. Not one of these ships carries a chaplain when at sea. True, a few passenger ships have, in some of their voyages, clergymen amongst their passengers, who sometimes interest themselves pastorally in the crews. In emigrant ships, daily prayers are usually arranged for, but in these the crews are not always allowed to participate. There are also other long-voyage ships and sailing coasters, in which the officers nobly fulfil their Christian duties towards their men. When in port the parochial clergy rarely officiate on board, and the bishops seldom recognize in their charges and pastorals that the shipping and barges are part of their diocesan responsibility. So that, from boyhood to the grave, merchant seamen are almost wholly dependent on lay teaching, whether at sea or in port. Almost

[1] "Lay Work in the Merchant Navy." Price 6*d*. Published by the Missions to Seamen, 11, Buckingham Street, Strand, London, W.C.

the only important exception to this is the twenty-three chaplains employed by the Missions to Seamen. Indeed, had they lay teachers of any kind, in any considerable number of merchant ships, we might well rejoice. There are, it is true, many noble efforts made by godly officers to minister in holy things to their men. And whole crews are thus often found converted to Christ; for no body of men respond so readily to the Gospel message, faithfully delivered by those who speak out of the fulness of their own heartfelt experience of the power of the Holy Ghost, than do men at sea. All honour to the officers who thus labour for souls. They may fairly claim encouragement, sympathy, instruction, and guidance from the National Church of this great maritime empire. Alas, little of these do they ordinarily receive at most ports, whether at home or abroad. Our dissenting brethren are not so "forgetful to entertain strangers," and have long been forward to countenance and encourage God's work on the seas. The Bishop of London, being in pastoral charge of all who are not within any diocesan bounds, is in some sort Bishop of the Seas. His lordship has recently decided to accord his formal recognition to those sea-officers who desire it for their highly responsible work for God amongst their crews. The Missions to Seamen endeavours to extend its influence over every ocean, by enrolling the godly officers as helpers, and by maintaining correspondence with them, through its chaplains, in whatever part of the world they may be sailing. There are now some 350 Missions to Seamen helpers officiating in as many merchant vessels.

To help those who conduct short week-day prayers for their crews, the Convocation of Canterbury has drawn up an excellent "Manual of Prayers, Scripture Reading, and Hymns for the use of Seamen at Sea." This excellent manual provides forms of united prayer for use on the morning and evenings of week-days only. Such united worship is of the character of family prayer—during which the crew stand—and does not last more than ten minutes. Captains usually make the necessary selections for themselves from the Book of Common Prayer, but the Convocation "Manual" does this for them. It is complete in itself, requires no reference to any other book, and saves a good deal of turning over leaves, which on a breezy deck without a table is inconvenient.

In the majority of the 38,000 registered British merchant ships, there is no public recognition whatever of Almighty God, His Word, nor His Day. There can be in such ships no kneeling in individual prayer, and no reading of the Bible in the forecastle. General godlessness and irreligion is the prevalent condition of these prayerless British vessels. The mixture of nationalities depraves the crews still more, except where Scandinavians predomi-

nate. There is little mutual respect or regard between the owners, the officers, and the men in such employs. In too many cases, there is not only indifference to each other's interests, but antagonism between employers and employed, which is fruitful of evil to all concerned. "The unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," is unknown in large numbers of British merchant ships, because no attempt is made to lead their crews "into the way of truth." Misery, indiscipline, and vice prevail, because the employers and the officers cast God out of their business. This is specially a case for intercessory prayer after the example of the Naval Prayer Union. Accordingly, the Missions to Seamen has invited the friends of the mercantile marine to join every Sunday morning in praying "that shipowners, officers, and crews may, in all their thoughts, words and deeds, seek God's Glory and the increase of His kingdom."

The late Admiral W. A. Baillie Hamilton well says:—

> It must be remembered that these men in general have been brought up in their boyhood in our schools; and, further, instructed in religion by our Church. But in consequence of their after-life, there was almost certain to be the lapse, loss and decay of that which they had imbibed in their childhood. And it is the chief object of the Missions to repair this melancholy waste.[1]

Not long since we met a chief mate on his way to Fleetwood from Liverpool, in immediate response to a telegram to join a Nova Scotian ship bound to Honduras. He knew nothing of the captain, the crew, or the vessel in which he was to sail next morning. He had served twenty years at sea, in about the same number of sailing ships, trading to all parts of the North Atlantic and adjacent seas. He was very proud of his achievements at Sunday School as a boy, by which he had received from the present Bishop of Derry prizes for superior answering and for attendance. Yet he had never in those twenty years known the united worship of Almighty God to be conducted at sea, and scouted the idea of its being possible to thus worship God on board ship. He couldn't say he had been often to church when his ship was in harbour; for churches did not care to have him. His sailor clothes, and his being "a stranger," made him unwelcome to the pew-openers; so there was no use of his going. He had never heard of a clergyman going on board any merchant vessel in any port, and could not credit such a thing occurring. He had not traded to the ports in which the Missions to Seamen chaplains work afloat since their appointment. He had known lay agents to visit ships when in port, but he had no great respect for them. He knew as much about

[1] The Churchman, No. 23, August, 1881, p. 322.

theology as they did, but he would gladly listen to a real clergyman, who had been to college, and knew what he was talking about. He had never known any seaman kneel in prayer in the forecastle—the thing was impossible—nobody but a landsman would think of such a thing. But stop—yes, there was a sailmaker in one ship with him, a man from Belfast, who always did so, night and morning. The crew tried the sailmaker's courage and patience a little, but they soon found that he could stand fire and they let him alone. There was no bad language in that ship; the men became a decent, well-behaved lot.

The chief mate was a honest, steady fellow, who knew what he had seen in life, but didn't know much more; and he was greatly astonished when he was told that there were many British merchant ships in which God was worshipped, His Word honoured, and His Day kept holy. He acknowledged this was so in the Scandinavian ships, but he could not understand Christian usages in English vessels. We need not say that it was pointed out to him how he, an ex-Sunday school scholar, had thrown away twenty years of opportunities for honouring and serving God, and urged upon him to give himself to God now, and serve Him faithfully in the forthcoming voyage. When we parted from him at Fleetwood, it was with a sad sense of what Admiral W. A. B. Hamilton calls "the lapse, loss and decay of that which they had imbibed in their childhood," going on in the prayerless ships of the British mercantile marine.

The more one contemplates the problem of converting the abundance of the sea, the more clear is it that the chief agency to be employed must be that of sailors themselves. It is in blue water the sailors are in the fittest frame of mind to receive religious exhortations. Their ships are their homes. The officers are their natural leaders. What naval officers do for their men in holy things, some merchant officers also nobly do, and all can do. It is not so much education that is wanted as the spirit of God converting the soul, and the subsequent guidance, instruction, and encouragement of the clergy on shore. The Missions to Seamen is striving to fill up this gap; but we need not say that 350 officers enrolled as Helpers, and brought under clerical guidance and sympathy, is not anything like the proportion of godly officers to be found in the 38,000 merchant ships. Nor are the forty-six ports occupied by its chaplains and honorary chaplains anything like the number of ports in the world into which British commerce carries mercantile officers and men. A very wide-spread, large hearted, and general organization is needed to meet the captains and their crews in whatever port they unfurl the British flag. The bishops of every seaboard diocese at home and abroad, should look on the sailors in their

harbours as part of their episcopal charge. The waterside clergy should overcome their official hydrophobia and board the shipping and barges in their parishes. And especial pains should be taken to make the captains and officers feel that they are looked upon as fellow-labourers with the clergy in conveying to their crews the ministrations of the Gospel of God. Sailors are missionaries for good or for evil to the whole world. Surely it is not a nautical question alone, but one for the whole Church of Christ, that their example, their influence, and their teachings should be that of the first sailor-apostles, and of their Lord.

W. DAWSON.

## ART. II.—WILLIAM RUFUS.

*The Reign of William Rufus.* By E. A. FREEMAN, M.A., Hon. D.C.L., LL.D. Two vols. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1882.

OF the reign of William II. historical students who may be ranked in the "general reader" class know probably very little. Yet the years during which William Rufus reigned are of high importance in relation to constitutional history, while they supply a store of interesting narratives as regards both persons and places. Mr. Freeman's present work, promised in his "History of the Norman Conquest," is rather long, and in certain places rather dry. Of those who take it in hand some, at all events, will think that the smaller details are elaborated with unnecessary care. There are two volumes, each five or six hundred pages long, on the history of only thirteen years. Who can master our national annals at this rate? For the sake of the large number of persons who are fond of reading history, but whose disposable time is limited, books which give a clear, full view of a reign or period in small compass, so that it may be mastered with enjoyment, are much to be desired. The writer of such an historical book, no doubt, should go to first-hand authorities, should weigh and compare the various documents and books which throw light upon his subject, should be accurate, judicial, and laborious. The work should be thoroughly done. Yet the result of his investigations, surely, may be given in a handy octavo, readable all through. For the ordinary reader compression is certainly expedient. Mr. Freeman's style, however, is well known, and the volumes before us will not diminish his reputation. To the cause of historical study he has rendered great services. His command of a subject

which he takes in hand is such that he delights to expand, to illustrate, and to enforce; and if he too often forgets that few of those who go through his detailed narratives are likely to have an historical mind well furnished, he, at all events, supplies material from which other authors may borrow, and so readers in general may profit. An author who shall stand to Mr. Freeman in the same relation which Dr. Cumming held with regard to the author of the *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, will find an extremely large circle of interested readers.

Of an eventful period, in the volumes before us, the story is admirably told. There is no lack of interesting incidents; battles and sieges, disputes among princes and barons, ecclesiastical revolts, social and domestic quarrels, are detailed with skill. The guiding thought of the work is easy to grasp. It is that William the Red, a Norman king, the son of the Norman Conqueror, was established on the English throne by English hands. The warfare waged during the first years of his reign was a victory won by Englishmen over Normans on English soil: in other words, the Norman conquest of England was completed by English hands. This important truth, set forth in its real bearings, is the key-note of Mr. Freeman's reflections. By the Norman conquest of England, as he points out, all that is implied in that name must be fully understood. "When Englishmen, by armed support of a Norman king, accepted the fact of the Norman Conquest, they in some measure changed its nature. In the act of completing the Conquest, they in some sort undid it. If we are told that the end of the Conquest came in the days of Rufus, in the days of Rufus came also the beginnings of the later effects of the Conquest." Thus, under William II. and Flambard,[1] the feudal side of the Conquest put on a systematic shape; but, on the other hand, during that period the anti-feudal tendencies of the Conquest grew and gained strength. On the Welsh marshes the power of England was extended; on the north-west[2] territory was won; in regard to Europe, England, now seen to be strong and wealthy, took a new place. In the company of the Red King, therefore, we are introduced to new lines of thought.

---

[1] Randolf Flambard, the chief minister ("Vizier") of William II. His astute devices for filling the king's coffers, particularly by the sale of bishoprics and by plundering Church property in general, are ably set forth in these volumes.

[2] In 1092, William enlarged the actual kingdom of England by the addition of a new shire, a new earldom—in process of time a new bishopric. The ruling lord or earl of Carlisle land was Dolfin, the son of Gospatric, a scion of the old Northumbrian princely house, and sprung by female descent from the Imperial stock of Wessex. Rufus drove out Dolfin; restored the forsaken city of Carlisle, and built the castle. Moreover, he settled a colony in the conquered land.

The struggle which kept the crown for Rufus [says Mr. Freeman], the last armed struggle between Englishmen and Normans on English ground, the fight of Pevensey and the siege of Rochester, forms a stirring portion of our annals—a portion whose interest yields only to that of a few great days like the days of Senlac and of Lewes. But the really great tale is after all that which is more silent and hidden. This was, above all things, the time when the Norman Conquest took root, as something which at once established the Norman power in England, and which ruled that the Norman power should, step by step, change into an English power. The great fact of Rufus' day is that Englishmen won the crown of England for a Norman king in fight against rebellious Normans. On that day the fact of the Conquest was fully acknowledged; it became something which, as to its immediate outward effects, there was no longer any thought of undoing. The house of the Conqueror was to be the royal house; there were to be no more revolts on behalf of the heir of Cerdic, no more messages sent to invite the heir of Cnut. And with the kingship of the Norman all was accepted which was immediately implied in the kingship of the Norman. But on that day it was further ruled that the kingship of the Norman was to change into an English kingship. . . . . These years helped, too, in a more silent way, if not to change the Norman rule at home into an English rule, at least to make things ready for the coming of the king who was really to do the work.

William Rufus, nominated by his father, was elected or approved king by Archbishop Lanfranc. To Robert, according to modern notions of hereditary right, the kingly crown of England, as well as the ducal coronet of Normandy, should have passed. English feeling at the time, doubtless, would have chosen Henry, youngest son of the Conqueror, for he alone was the son of a crowned king and a man born in the land. But the last wish of "William the Great" was that his island crown should pass to William, his second surviving son. No orders were given for the coronation, but Lanfranc was requested to crown him, if he thought it right. As soon as the dying king had dictated a letter conveying his wishes, William Rufus started (September 8) for the haven of Touques; with him journeyed one of the king's chaplains, and also Morkere and Wulfnoth,[1] who represented the mightiest of the fallen houses of England. Before they left Norman ground the news came that all was over. From Winchester William hastened to the presence of Lanfranc, and with the least possible delay the new king was crowned (September 26). There was not the slightest

[1] Morkere, the son of Ælfgar, once the chosen Earl of the Northumbrians; Wolfnoth, the youngest son of Godwine and brother of Harold. Set free by the Conqueror in his fatal illness, they tasted the air of freedom for a few days only. They were put in prison at Winchester. The son of Godwine and the grandson of Leofric might either of them be dangerous to the son of the Norman William.

opposition. All parties, probably, were taken by surprise. "The crown which had passed to Eadward from a long line of kingly forefathers, the crown which Harold had worn by the free gift of the English people, the crown which the first William had won by his sword and had kept by his wisdom, now passed to the second of his name and house. And it passed, to all appearance, with the perfect goodwill of all the dwellers in the land, conquerors and conquered alike." From Westminster William went again to his capital, Winchester, and threw open the stores of his father's treasury for gifts and bribes, but mainly for the benefit of churches and for alms to the poor for the late king's soul.[1] The hoard at Winchester served his purposes well. At the Christmas feast and assembly in Westminster were present the two archbishops, and several bishops, including Odo of Bayeux, newly released from prison, who received again from his nephew the earldom of Kent.

In the spring of the next year a rebellion broke out. As the native Chronicler puts it, "the land was mightily stirred, and was filled with mickle treason, for all the richest Frenchmen (*riceste Frencisce men*) that were in this land would betray their lord the king, and would have his brother to king, Robert that was Earl in Normandy." The leader in this revolt was Odo, Bishop of Bayeux. Odo was dissatisfied because the chief place in the king's confidence was held by another bishop, William of Saint-Calais, who had succeeded the murdered Walcher in the See of Durham; but against the primate Lanfranc, Odo bore a bitter grudge. The chief Normans in England, then, plotted how the king might be killed or handed over alive to Robert. Bishop William, it seems clear, turned against his benefactor; being suspected, he escaped to his castle at Durham. At the Easter Gemót,[2] the great nobles did not appear; each in his castle was making ready for war. With two members of the ducal house of Normandy were Roger of Montgomery, Earl of Shrewsbury; Roger the Bigod, father of earls; Roger of Lacy, great in the shires from Berkshire to Shropshire; Hugh of Grantmesnil, with his nephew the Marquess Robert of Rhuddlan, the terror of the Northern Cymry; and other great lords. Hugh of Chester, however, clave to the king. At first the rebel lords were successful. Bristol Castle, occupied by the warrior Bishop of Coutances, Geoffrey of Mowbray, was turned into a den of robbers. Bath was burned, and Berkeley district laid waste. An attack on Worcester, however, signally failed; and the re-

[1] Robert, received as Duke of the Normans, did "the same pious work among the poor and the churches of his duchy."

[2] The Witenagemót was held three times a year. It gradually became less popular and less powerful.

pulse was mainly due to an English bishop. The Norman garrison in Worcester, by whom the virtues of the bishop were honoured, entreated Wulfstan to enter the fortress. Wulfstan, the one remaining bishop of English blood, was loyal to William; and the king's troops, with the citizens of Worcester, repulsed the rebels. The most exciting scenes of the struggle were in Kent and Sussex. The Bishop of Bayeux made the castle of Rochester his headquarters. Pevensey was occupied by a rebel lord. In the stronghold of Arundel, Earl Roger, not needed in Shrewsbury, was watching events; but William of Warren, faithful to the king, was in strength at Lewes, and the great earl kept quiet. After a time, indeed, William, a typical Norman—sometimes a fox and sometimes a lion—won over Earl Roger. The mass of the people, apparently, were against the Norman lords. By the advice of the bishops, or by his own discernment, the king saw that the course of safety was to throw himself on the people. As king of the English he sent forth a proclamation to the sons of the soil. He was lavish of promises. King William would reign over his people like Eadward, or Cnut, or Ælfred; they should have the best laws that ever before were in England; in particular, the hunting laws were to be relaxed, and oppressive unrighteous taxation should no longer be made. The English people, influenced perhaps by Lanfranc and Wulfstan, and hating Odo and the leading Norman lords,[1] took up the king's cause; his promises were credited. Thirty thousand of the true natives of the land came together of their own free will, and William the Red, at the head of a zealous host of horse and foot, Norman and English, set forth from London.[2] Tunbridge Castle was stormed; Pevensey Castle surrendered; Norman troops sent over by Duke Robert were hindered by the English from landing; and, finally, in Rochester, Odo and Robert of Bellême, after a sturdy defence, were compelled to crave for

[1] "If the Bishop of Bayeux and the Bishop of Coutances, if Robert of Mortain and Robert of Mowbray, if Eustace of Boulogne and the fierce Lord of Bellême, could all be smitten down by English axes or driven into banishment from the English shores; if their estates on English soil could be again parted out as the reward of English valour, the work of the Norman Conquest would indeed seem to be undone. And it would be undone none the less, although the king whose crown was made sure by English hands was himself the son of the Conqueror of England."

[2] The English exhorted William to win for himself the empire of the whole island. [Ord. Vit. 667A. "Passim per totum Albionem *impera*. . . . ."] The phrase, says Mr. Freeman, is worth noting, even if it be a mere flourish of the historian. It marks that the change of dynasty was fully accepted, that the son of the Conqueror was fully acknowledged as the heir of all the rights of Æthelstan the Glorious, and of Eadmund the Doer-of-great-deeds. A daughter of their race still sat on the Scottish throne, but for Malcolm, the savage devastator of northern England, Englishmen could not be expected to feel any love.

pardon at the hands of the victorious king. Odo left England and all that he had in England for ever. The rebellion was at an end. In the Whitsun assembly, June 4, 1088, the king, in a position to reward and punish, made some grants of confiscated lands. For the chief rebels there was an amnesty at once.

The story of Bishop William of Durham is a puzzling one. His own version—written by himself or by some local admirer—cannot be trusted; yet it agrees in the main with the narratives of the southern writers. He protested that he was wholly innocent of any crime against the king. A safe-conduct was sent to Durham, that the accused might with confidence journey to the king's court. In November, at Salisbury, the debate was held. At the outset, the bishop raised the question whether he ought not to be judged and the other bishops to judge him, in full episcopal dress; but Lanfranc replied, "We can judge very well clothed as we are, for garments do not hinder truth." After some legal discussion, the bishop flatly refused to do right to the king,[1] that is, to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the Court. Lanfranc and the lay-members of the Court pressed their demand with firmness, but in vain. Bishop William's words, says Mr. Freeman, "amounted to a casting aside of all the earlier jurisprudence of England," but they were "only a natural inference from that act of the Conqueror which had severed the jurisdictions which ancient English custom had joined together." The bishop at all events was outspoken. He told the barons of the realm and the other laymen present that with them he had nothing to do. In vain his own Metropolitan, Thomas of York, appealed to him. The wrath of the laymen waxed hot; and angry words flew forth; but finally the bishop, declaring that he had not been canonically summoned, and was not tried according to the canons, appealed to "the Apostolic See of Rome:"—

> Such an appeal as this [says Mr. Freeman] was indeed going to the root of the matter. It was laying down the rule against which Englishmen had yet to strive for more than four hundred years. William of Saint-Calais not only declared that there were causes with which no English tribunal was competent to deal, but he laid down that among such causes were to be reckoned all judgments where any bishop—if not every priest—was an accused party. Bishop William could not even claim that, as one charged with an ecclesiastical offence, he had a right to appeal to the highest ecclesiastical judge. Even such a claim as this was a novelty, either in Normandy or in England, but Bishop William was not charged with any ecclesiastical offence. . . . William the Great . . . . was indeed in all causes and over all persons ecclesiastical and temporal within his dominions supreme. But

[1] *Rectitudinem facere* is the technical phrase.

the moment he was gone, that great supremacy seems to have fallen in pieces.

The king's patience had borne a good deal, but it was now beginning to give way. In short, sharp sentences, spoken with a fierce look, he rebuked the bishop's revolt. Taking a very practical view of the case (a reading of the Church and State question, however, which Ritualists of Queen Victoria's reign refuse to accept), he said:—"My will is that you give me up your castle, as you will not abide by the sentence of my court." But the bishop was wily and stubborn: he kept on protesting; he talked of his conscience as obedient to the *Christian* law.[1] The end of it was that he was allowed to leave England; and on Nov. 19, the king's officers entered the castle of Durham and disseized the bishop of his church and castle and all his land. By the sentence of forfeiture pronounced by the Court, all his goods had become the property of the crown.

Of this Bishop William, in connection with ecclesiastical revolt, we hear again, but no longer as a suppliant at the Court of Rome. Honourably received by Duke Robert, this "spiritual" person was placed in charge of the Duchy of Normandy; and when, in the year 1095, Anselm taught the doctrine that the King of the English had a superior on earth, that the decrees of the Witan of England could be rightly appealed from to a foreign power, William of Saint-Calais, the convicted traitor who had posed as a persecuted confessor,[2] came forward to maintain the royal supremacy.

The case of Anselm is full of interest. But within the limits of this review we cannot at all discuss it. For Anselm's appeal to Rome, and his subsequent action as between Pope and King, a laboured apology is made in these volumes. Referring to Dean Church's "Life of Anselm," Mr. Freeman says:—"The Dean had not been led to notice that earlier action of William of Saint-Calais which from my point of view is all-important for the story of Anselm." This piece of history—the appeal to Rome by Bishop William—he adds, "has never been told at length by any writer, though Dr. Stubbs has shown full appreciation of its constitutional bearings." That it was not Anselm who took the first step towards the "establishment of foreign and usurped jurisdictions within the realm," he repeats again and again; and he remarks,

---

[1] He seems to have pointed to a volume in his own hand. "Christianam legem quam hic scriptam habeo, testem invoco." The remark, says Mr. Freeman, most likely refers to the False Decretals.

[2] Mr. Freeman justly remarks that in the debate at Salisbury the bishop "was simply availing himself of every legal subtlety, of every pretended ecclesiastical privilege, in order to escape a real trial, in which he knew that he would have no safe ground on the merits of the case."

as in support of his own view, that Dean Hook's estimate of Anselm became more favourable.

In May, 1089, Lanfranc died. One of the abettors of the Conquest, the righthand man of the Conqueror, the Lombard prelate had found the way to the goodwill of the conquered people, with whom and with whose land either his feelings or his policy led him to identify himself. Up to the time of his death the worst features of the character of William Rufus had not shown themselves in their fulness. He had been a dutiful son, and there was something of dutiful submission to Lanfranc, the guardian to whose care his father had entrusted him. As soon as the Archbishop died, William[1] burst all bounds. The man had been either corrupted by prosperity, or else, like Tiberius,[2] his natural character was now for the first time able to show itself. His pride was boundless; he was wasteful, capricious, and cruel. What makes him stand out in so specially hateful a light is indulgence in the foulest forms of vice, combined with a shocking form of irreligion and blasphemy.[3] There was in him something of a chivalrous spirit; and when he pledged his word, he kept to it; but his treaties with other princes and his promises to his people went for nothing. The land was bowed down with *ungeld*—money, that is, wrung from the people by unrede, unright, and unlaw:—"in his days ilk right fell away, and ilk unright for God and for world uprose." He had promised the English good laws and freedom from unrighteous taxes, but the promises with which he had bought their help in the day of his danger were utterly trampled under foot. Never was a king more hated.[4]

---

[1] At that time probably about thirty years of age. William II. was a man of no great stature, of a thick square frame, with a projecting stomach. His bodily strength was great. He had the yellow hair of his race, and the ruddiness of his countenance gave him the surname which has stuck to him so closely.

[2] Ann. vi. 51. But an English Tacitus could not make many stages in the downfall of the Red King.

[3] In the long roll-call of evil kings, not one, perhaps, has so evil a place. He stands well-nigh alone, says Mr. Freeman, "in bringing back the foulest vices of heathendom into a Christian land, and at the same time openly proclaiming himself the personal enemy of his Maker." It seems probable that in taking the part of the Jew and annoying the Christian, he found a malicious satisfaction. He is charged with a sort of personal defiance of the Almighty. When he recovered from the sickness, in 1093, he said, "God shall never see me a good man; I have suffered too much at His hands."

[4] The distinguished historian gives an interesting sketch of the warrior-companion of the king, Robert of Bellême, afterwards of Shrewsbury, of Bridgnorth, and of both Montgomeries. "Restless ambition, reckless contempt of the rights of others, were common to him with many of his neighbours and contemporaries. But he stands almost alone

He was "in hunting from his own men with an arrow offshot." This is the statement of the Chronicle as to William's death, and according to our author, it is the only safe one. Nothing more is certainly known.

On August 1, 1100, the king was in the New Forest, with his head-quarters at Brockenhurst. He had with him Gilbert of Laigle, Walter Tirel, and other men. Henry, Ætheling and Count, if not one of the party, was not far off; like his brother William, he had, say the stories, had his omens, if not his visions. Walter Tirel, a baron of France, who had been attracted to the Red King's service by the fame of his liberality, was chief among the hunting company, and as on other days, William's special comrade. They held that discourse which is called in the Old-French tongue by the expressive words *gaber* and *gab*. Walter began to jeer at the king, and, as it seems, his mocking vein turned to anger. The king boasted what he would do in France before Christmas; whereupon the Frenchman burst forth in wrathful words.[1] How far this story is correct, and whether or no there was a plot on Tirel's part, we cannot tell.

"Thereafter on the morrow after Lammas-day [August 2nd], was the King William in hunting from his own men with an arrow offshot, and then to Winchester brought, and in the bishopric buried." These words of our own Chronicler suggest treason, but they do not directly assert it; they name no one man as the doer. In most versions Walter Tirel is mentioned; but his act is made chance-medley, and not wilful murder. It is certain that Walter himself, long after, when he had nothing either to hope or fear one way or the other, denied in the most solemn way that he had any share in the deed or any knowledge of it. The number of men who must have felt that they would be the better if an arrow could be brought to light on the Red King, must have been great. Indeed, the wonder is, not

---

in his habitual delight in the infliction of human suffering. . . . . The received forms of cruelty, blinding, and mutilation, were not enough for him; he brought the horrors of the East into Western Europe. . . . ." It is even said that the monster tore out the eyes of a little boy, his own godchild. When King Henry sent him to spend his days in prison, it was in a prison so strait and darksome that the outer world knew not whether he was dead or alive. Called Robert of Bellême, as the son of his mother, Robert of Montgomery, lord of Arundel and of Shrewsbury, and also a Norman potentate, had joined in his own person three princely inheritances. He was a great builder of castles. It was his father, Earl Roger, who built Wenlock Abbey.

[1] Geoffrey Gaimar ("Chroniques Anglo-Normandes," 1. 52)—

> De male mort pussent morir
> Li Burgoinon et li François,
> Si souzget soient as Englois!

that the shaft struck him in the 13th year of his reign, but that no hand had stricken him long before. The arrow, by whomsoever shot, set England free from oppression such as she never felt before or after, at the hand of a single man.

In taking our leave of these volumes we should say that they are beautifully printed, and contain valuable appendices, and interesting maps. Those who know the ruins of Wenlock, Rhuddlan, Arundel, Bridgnorth, and other historical places of William and Henry's reign, will enjoy Mr. Freeman's accurate descriptions. As to the spelling, we have followed the distinguished author, though, as regards many names, with reluctance. We are old-fashioned enough to prefer Alfred to Ælfred, and Edward to Eadward. Mr. Brewer protested against this fad, and Dr. Stubbs ignores it.

## ART. III.—EPISCOPACY IN ENGLAND AND WALES; ITS GRADUAL DEVELOPMENT TO THE PRESENT TIME.

### PART III.—GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS.

THUS far, we have glanced at Christianity in England during two great periods. The British Church existed alone, or with aid from the missionaries of Hibernic origin, for 416 years—that is to say, from A.D. 180 to 596. The Saxon Church, mainly of Latin origin, but not exclusively so for the first half century, has a history of 470 years, or from 596 to 1066. The former was slow and gradual in its development, but this was inevitable from the method of its introduction,—chiefly by individuals, and at various times and places. The latter took possession of the country systematically and with great rapidity, as both in its introduction and its extension it was more authoritative and formal. In the Latin Church, a bishop was usually the chaplain of the king; and when the latter became a "nursing father" in his little domain, his subjects were naturally predisposed to follow his example.[1] Thus the Church and the State worked together in harmony, and though civil discord might change the area of kingdoms or the power of their rulers, the Church maintained its hold, in alliance with

[1] Hence, a bishop-*ric* is literally a bishop's kingdom; the Anglo-Saxon *ric* or *rice* being the equivalent of *regnum*.—"Alfric's Vocabulary," 10th century; and "Anglo-Saxon Vocabulary," 11th century. ["Mayer's Vocabularies."]

the other parts of the island and with continental nations. There was a somewhat similar relation of friendly intercourse and mutual good offices in after years, when the parochial system became a great fact. The parish was coextensive with the estate, and therefore, large or small; the landowner was the founder of the Church, and hence the lay-patron; the rector was virtually his chaplain, and all the residents were parishioners.

But though Christianity had had a place in the country for nearly a thousand years, at the time of the Norman Conquest the western portion or Cambria contained only five dioceses, including Hereford; the Saxon Church, on the other hand, comprised so many as fourteen; not reckoning the little ones which had been suppressed, or rather consolidated, of which there were fourteen in all. The difference in number is not remarkable when we compare the area and population of the Saxon territory, now England, with those of the British territory, now Wales. Reckoning Lindisfarne, Ripon, Hexham, and Durham as four, there were five sees in the north; but as the three small and temporary ones had disappeared, there were really only two: York, the centre of the powerful kingdom of Northumbria, and Durham, her younger sister. It thus appears that from 810 when Hexham was absorbed by Durham, till 1542 when Chester was transferred to the Northern province, and, therefore, at the time of the Conquest, there were only two[1] dioceses for the same population.

The whole nineteen dioceses were then, and for some time after, grouped around three centres—that is, so long as the Bishop of St. David's was regarded as a metropolitan. Thus, Canterbury was the centre of twelve, York of two, and St. David's of five; though, possibly, Hereford may have been transferred to Canterbury before the sees which were purely Welsh, on the limits of England and Wales being better defined.

There is a curious diversity in the use of the word "province," which it may be well to notice. (1) In England it is used only in an ecclesiastical sense; and probably not one-fourth of the people have a clear understanding of its meaning. (2) In France it is used only in a civil sense, as referring to the historic countries which were annexed from time to time—by conquest, purchase, inheritance, &c.—to constitute or enlarge the kingdom. Of these there were about thirty, while the departments answering in a great degree to our counties, number about eighty. (3) In Ireland, the word is used in both senses; and the four provinces are marked on every map of the country. Each was

[1] Carlisle, which was founded in Norman times, was exceptional, as we shall see.

a kingdom,[1] and each retained its own Archbishop till after 1833.

On the conversion of the King of Surrey, in 680, the whole country had practically embraced Christianity. This was less than 100 years from the arrival of Augustine and his monks; but they had done their work of organizing and extending with praiseworthy energy and with great rapidity. Theodore, "a Grecian," was Archbishop of Canterbury from 668 to 692, during which time some of the smaller dioceses were united, one or two new ones added, and Canterbury was made gradually more and more the ecclesiastical capital of the country. The people saw a unity of design in religious affairs, and it was natural for them to desire a similar unity in civil and social matters. They witnessed the gradations among the clergy, and saw that each was useful and obedient in his own place; and the principles of civil liberty were suggested, in accordance with which each makes some sacrifice for the general good.

Further, the Councils of the Church naturally suggested a similar Council for the nation, and thus the germ of a Parliament was seen; while the Acts of the Councils were, on the same principle, obviously the precursors and rough exemplars of our Statute Laws. It is clear, therefore, that the State—which as yet, in its united form, had no existence—was moulded by the Church, though we may hear the contrary every day from persons who perhaps never made themselves acquainted with a single century of the nation's history.

It was not till 733 that the King of Mercia dared to call himself "King of Britain," but this was by anticipation, for he really was not so at the time. The King of Northumbria was not only powerful in and around his own capital of York, but he reigned over a considerable part of modern Scotland. It was one of the Kings of Northumbria that gave his own name to "auld Reekie,"[2] the capital of Scotland; and another, on the west side, subdued the kingdom of Strathclyde,[3] including its capital, Alcluid, or Dunbritton.[4]

---

[1] Meath was in some respects peculiar. In the eleventh century it also had a king, and he was the chief or lord paramount, taking precedence of the other four, and receiving tribute from them. His kingdom was a *quasi* province, comprising eleven small towns, at which Bishops were situated, but without definite dioceses. Also, the Bishop of Meath is still styled "Most Reverend," and takes precedence next after the two Archbishops.

[2] Eadwine's-burg, Edinburgh.

[3] There were several small kingdoms in Scotland during her early history. There was formerly a regulus or kingling of Athol,—"Rex Atfotliae et seneschallus insularum." Indeed, it seems to have been the cradle of their sovereigns.—Skene's *Highlanders*, ii. 137, 138.

[4] Dumbarton.

In 640, the entire country was laid out in 45,000 parishes; but, though this was recognized in 970, as the law of the land, it does not follow that there were anything like that number of clergy. Many of these "parishes," though held by separate owners, were no doubt only equivalent to our modern townships. In 758, churchyards were first erected; and each of these special burying-places was reverently denominated "God's-acre." In 761, and especially in 970, trial by jury was enacted, and definitely arranged in 1177 and 1194. In 809 the kingdoms of the Octarchy had been consolidated into three:—Northumbria, Mercia, and Wessex. In 828, the country had made another and important step in advance. The three little kingdoms had been fused into one, and Egbert was the eighth and last *Bretwalda*.[1] In the same year a council at Winchester ratified the term "ENGLAND" as a permanent geographical word. A similar concentration—which, within certain limits, is always a sign of progress—was going on in Scotland. Kenneth Mac-Alpine, about 842, conquered all Scotland, almost annihilating the Picts, especially in the North. It is very remarkable that Hibernia gave to Caledonia her present name (*Scot*-land), her religion (Christianity), and her ancient language (the Gaelic or Celtic). And Scotland afterwards handsomely repaid the debt, by giving to Ireland some of the best of her colonists, in the seventeenth century, the Presbyterians of Down and Antrim and Londonderry. In 920, Edward was styled *Rex Anglorum*, and Athelstan, in 937, was the first "King of all England."

Other Church facts may be told almost in chronological order. In 793, Offa introduced the payment of "Peter's pence" to Rome, as an atonement for the murder of his son-in-law; and this was soon converted into a regular payment by the country. In 844, tithes were first granted to the clergy in a general assembly by Ethelwald; and in 855 a tenth-part of the kingdom of Wessex was granted to the clergy in a Council of Winchester, as a recompense for their sufferings from the Danes. In 1100 the clergy were deprived of the power of conferring knighthood; but it is not so clear when they first assumed or possessed it.

The following are a few facts in our civil history. In 953, the kingdom was divided into counties or shires, and the tax called Dane-gelt was the origin of direct taxation among us. In 1079, cities were first incorporated, and from 1136 rent was paid in money. In 1199 legal interest for money was allowed, the

[1] Though the Saxons were a divided people, they felt how important it was for them to act together. Accordingly, a leader or commander-in-chief was elected from time to time; and of these there were eight in all. Ella was the first, elected in 490, and Egbert the eighth and last. The title was eventually absorbed in that of king.

rate being 10 per cent. In 1188, the Christian subjects of the king were ordered to pay £70,000 towards the expenses of the third Crusade, the Jewish subjects paying £60,000. In 1292 the "taxation" of Pope Nicholas was made, the clergy being obliged to pay one-tenth of their incomes for the support of the last Crusade.

The first attempt at a Parliament was made in 1070, and the "Constitutions of Clarendon" were issued in 1164. In 1205, the first regular Parliament was summoned, but it was baronial only. In 1214, and again in 1254, the representation of counties was recognized and made permanent; and in 1265 commoners like burgess representatives were first introduced. It is commonly said that "the *Magna Charta*, 1215, was the first English Act of Parliament;" but regular Statute Law was practically unknown till the reign of Henry III. Wales was thoroughly united to England in 1283.

A mere comparison of these dates conveys an important lesson; for it shows, with other facts, that the Church existed for centuries before the present nation existed, or its name could be used; also before the first Parliament was held or the first Act passed. To say, then, that Parliament created the Church, is a falsehood, almost too gigantic for description, or too ridiculous for notice. It would be much the same thing to say that St. Paul wrote the Song of Solomon—that the Duke of Wellington won the battle of Flodden in 1513—or that our present Prince of Wales is the great-grandfather of George III.

Further, many of the great offices of State, if not, indeed, the most of them, were necessarily filled by clergy; for in the early years of our Norman kings, and even during this whole period, the only persons who could be called learned were those in Holy Orders. Let us confine ourselves to bishops alone, for the 443 years from the accession of William I. to that of Henry VIII., and see whether without them the "King's Government could have been carried on," to use the words of the late Duke of Wellington. The episcopal ranks furnished 92 Lord High Chancellors, 50 Lord Treasurers, 5 Lord Chief Justices, 4 Lord Privy Seals, 7 Lord Presidents of Wales, 4 Chancellors of the Exchequer, 7 Masters of the Rolls, 3 Principal Secretaries of State, 1 Lord Deputy of Ireland, 2 Lord Keepers, and 2 Lord Presidents of the North.[1]

But if we look beyond the bishops, to the clergy generally, the assistance which they gave may be seen from a single instance. Within the period referred to, there were 162 Lord High Chan-

[1] Tabulated from Haydn's "Book of Dignities" (Beatson's "Political Index Modernized.")

cellors, and of these, in 102 cases, or 63 per cent., the office was filled by clerics. Some were only Archdeacons, Deans, or Bishops elect, during their respective terms of office. Frequently the office was held two, three, or four times by the same ecclesiastics;—just as Lord Cairns and Lord Selborne have held it twice in our own times, Lord Eldon three times, and Lords Lyndhurst and Cottenham four times each.[1]

A. HUME.

*(To be continued.)*

## ART. IV.—RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES.

### THEIR CLASSIFICATION, AND THE RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EACH GROUP.

THE charge has been often made against the Church of England, that the trammels of Establishment have deprived her of that zeal, which is the conspicuous adornment of voluntary Churches. The best answer to this charge is to be found in an appeal to the number and varied aims of her religious Societies. They offer a convincing proof that while our Church is fully alive to the vantage-ground afforded her by the endowments with which she has been entrusted through the liberality of former ages, she is none the less aware of the strenuous efforts which are still required of her, in order to keep pace with the growth and extension of the British Empire at home and abroad. The infancy of these Societies is coeval with the awakened sense of the vast responsibilities, upon which, as an empire, our country was then entering. Their extension and development mark the period when our trade and commerce were expanding by leaps and bounds, and as the natural consequence our population increased by rapid strides commensurate with the opening up of vast spheres of labour and industry on every side. The religious historian can point with pride to the phases and characteristics of more than one great religious movement, which took its rise during the same period, and to which may be definitely attributed the institution of some among these religious Societies. We may well assume that the sight of retired hamlets and quiet watering-places, suddenly developing into vast cities all alive with the hum of in-

[1] The first Lord High Chancellor was Bishop of Elmham and Dunwich (now Norwich); and though the office was held sixteen times during the reigns of the first three Norman kings, it is certain that it was held fourteen times by clerics; and it is possible or probable that the remaining two were so in like manner, though the fact is not formally stated.

dustry, was among the means by which He who had compassion on the multitudes, because they were as sheep without a shepherd, intended to quicken kindred impulses in the hearts of His followers.

The claims of these religious Societies upon the support of Churchmen, will, of course, vary in accordance with the spiritual advantages or deficiencies of particular localities. In some, the need is so pressing that Local or Diocesan Societies may well be excused for absorbing somewhat exclusively the energies of the Church. The relation which should exist between Diocesan Societies and those whose sphere of operation is coextensive with the Church at large, may well engage our future consideration. For the present it will be best to confine our attention to those Societies which invite our sympathies, not as members of this or that locality or diocese, but as members generally of the Church of England. In no part of England does the obligation to forget themselves by comparison in the wants of the Church at large lie more heavily upon Churchmen than in those still numerous agricultural dioceses containing a large proportion of small parishes, whose claims can hardly be said to exhaust either the pockets or the interests of their wealthier residents. It should never be forgotten that it is in the large towns of England that the battle of the Church is now being fought under uncertain odds. At this moment the dioceses of Manchester and Ripon, containing each nearly two millions of souls, are no better provided with benefices than an agricultural diocese like that of Salisbury, which contains considerably less than half a million.

The contrast is remarkable between the number of Societies which were in existence during the latter half of the last and of the present centuries. In the former period, the ground was occupied by only five Societies, of which three were concerned with the children of the clergy; the two others, being the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, venerable even then with the weight of years, having been founded in the year 1698, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The present century began with the formation of the other great missionary Society of our Church, whose income last year, in spite of the earlier start by one hundred years of her sister, exceeded that of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel by nearly as many thousands of pounds. Every decade of this century may be said to have witnessed the birth of some new Church society, until in its latter half the number of our Societies has become so bewildering, that, according to the German proverb, we can hardly see the forest for the trees. An era of minute, and sometimes spasmodic, subdivision has followed one, in which too many functions devolved upon one Society, an illustration of

which survives in the practice still continued by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, of making grants for building purposes and for missionary agents, besides fulfilling her more distinctive vocation of a book Society. The effects resulting from the present wilderness of Societies are becoming undesirable. Thoughtful men lose time in considering what Societies are most deserving of their support. Benevolent persons bestow their offerings disproportionately, massing them on one set of Church purposes, while they overlook the claims of others. Men of the world, and Christian people too, who have never fairly faced with their consciences the question of the proportion of their incomes, which belongs not to themselves or families, but to God alone, escape from giving under the ready plea that it is impossible to give to every Society. Nor, again, is the effect altogether good on those who benefit by the instrumentality of these Societies. They are tempted, like the Matine bee, to gather honey from every opening flower, while the Societies themselves remain in ignorance of the extent to which their generosity has already been forestalled by that of some of their sister Societies.

In the hope of unravelling this tangled skein, and simplifying the issues presented by these numerous agencies, the following remarks are offered. If it can be distinctly shown, that there are some six main channels in which the course of charity for Church purposes tends to flow, it will then be an easier task for persons of moderate income to select under each of these heads the particular Society, where several exist, in connection with it, which commends itself most to the giver. There will be the less chance of his losing the satisfaction of feeling that he, too, has contributed something to aid the cause of every department of Church work. He will have given with his eyes more open to a clear view of the relation of these departments to one another. He will also be the better able to decide for himself the question of their relative importance. If some agreement could once be arrived at as to the best method for thus mapping out the ground, some check might then be given to the too extensive evolution of Societies in this century, and the survival of the fittest among them in each department might then be more likely to be attained through a more discriminating selection of the species. The better the division of this subject, the firmer will be the mastery of the Church over the various means at her disposal. "*Divide et impera*" should be her motto.

I had hoped at first to discover some principle of classification, which should avoid the confusion arising from cross divisions. One principle of division was clearly suggested by the different character of the agency employed by particular

societies for their religious purposes. Some, for instance, like most missionary societies properly so called, employ living agents: some, like the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the National Society address themselves more especially to the instrumentality of the press: others, like the Church Building Society, provide the materials and plans requisite for buildings devoted to religious purposes. This was the *first* principle of classification which occurred to me; but it will be felt at once, that though clear enough in itself, it does not mark out with sufficient emphasis the salient features of the whole ground. A farther subdivision seems imperatively called for of that item in the class, which has been spoken of above under the title of living agents. Hence it becomes important to take notice of a *second* principle of classification, which regards the area within which these living agents exercise their calling. This brings us at once to the most elementary division of Societies according as they deal with home or foreign missions. No distinction is more familiarly known than this; confusion worse confounded would result from ignoring it; and yet perhaps its very obviousness has led many a person in the allotment of his subscriptions to lose sight of the great need there is in a competently organized Christian Society of a much farther development of Societies than that which would follow from merely regarding them under the category of place or area. Yet a *third* principle of classification remains to be alluded to, which divides their aims according as they are directed to promoting the welfare, not only of those who are ministered unto, for whose sake it is that these Societies primarily exist, but also of those who minister unto them. That "the labourer is worthy of his hire," is a maxim abundantly taken into account by religious Societies, though in a way which is at times not altogether satisfactory. It is noticeable that of the five Church Societies which alone existed in the latter half of the last century, three concerned themselves with the well-being not of the classes ministered unto but of the ministers themselves. And at this moment the multiplicity and intersection of Societies which exist for the relief of the poorer clergy and their families calls loudly for some well-considered scheme of consolidation.

I hope in this complicated subject I have made myself clear, at any rate, upon the three principles of classification which occurred to me. All three may be employed in my analysis of religious Societies generally. I place foremost in my groups of Societies two for which I am indebted to my second principle, Home Missions and Foreign Missions. From my first principle I derive two more groups, which may be shortly described as Printing Press Societies, and outward fabric and materials Societies, or, in other words, Building Societies. From my third

**Principle of classification are derived the two remaining groups of Societies—Poorer Clergy Sustentation Societies and Clerical Eleemosynary Societies. The accompanying scheme will serve to illustrate this analysis at a glance:—**

## CONSPECTUS OF RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES,

WHOSE SPHERE OF OPERATIONS IS CO-EXTENSIVE WITH THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

(The date of institution is appended.)

**A.** Societies whose instruments are living agents, viz., all Missionary Societies.

or **B.** { (a.) Literature, the printing press,

or { (b.) Architecture, bricks and mortar.

(a.) Foreign, *e.g.*

- Heathen and Mahomedans primarily—C. M. S. 1799.
- Colonial and Continental. 1823.
- Our Colonists primarily. S. P. G. 1701.
- Specialized.
  - Europe. Spanish and Portuguese, 1876.
  - Asia. British Syrian Schools, 1860.
  - Africa. Cape Town Aid Association, 1868.
  - America. South American Mission, 1844.
  - Jews. 1809.

(b.) Home, *e.g.*

- Bible S.
- S. P. C. K. 1698.
- Religious Tract S.
- National S. Special. Sunday School Institute, 1843.
- Land.
  1. Pastoral Aid S. 1836.
  2. Additional Curates, 1837.
- Special, *e.g.* Bishop of London's Fund, 1863.
- Sea. Missions to Seamen, 1856.

- For Schools and Training Colleges: National Society, 1811.
- For Churches and Chapels: Incorporated Church Building S. 1818.

**C.** Religious Societies whose aim is the direct benefit of Ministers, and not of those ministered unto.

**a.** As a matter of justice. "The labourer is worthy of his hire."

- For Curates: Curates Augmentation Fund, 1866.
- Poor Incumbents: Marquis of Lorne's Fund, 1873.

**b.** Eleemosynary.

- The Clergy themselves, *e.g.* Friend of the Clergy Corporation.
- Children, *e.g.*
  1. Festival of Sons of Clergy, 1655.
  2. Corporation of Sons of Clergy, 1678.
  3. St. John's Found. School, Leatherhead, 1852.
  4. Friend of the Clergy Corporation, 1849.
- Widows and Orphans.

**D.** Special Church Societies for Special Evils, *e.g.*, Church of England Temperance Society, 1873.

Our next task is to estimate the relative importance of these six groups or classes which have been thus enumerated in couples :—

A. a. Foreign Missions.
b. Home Missions.
B. a. Literature Societies.
b. Building Societies.
C. a. Poorer Clergy Sustentation Societies.
b. Clerical Eleemosynary Societies.

A. In popular estimation the claims of Foreign Missions occupy the foremost rank. Her zeal for the missionary cause is the universally accepted criterion of a standing or a falling church. The most striking illustration of the weight of the simplest words of Christ and of the continuity of His church is to be found in the ready acceptance which has been given by all churches which yet have a name to live, to His words, "Go ye, and teach all nations." Every Christian admits that "the field is the world," and nothing short of it. In parishes where all is lifelessness and spiritual decay, the last expiring embers are probably connected with some faint effort still to maintain a collection in behalf of one or other of our two great Missionary Societies; or if it is felt more chivalrous to support some less favoured Society, a ready choice is offered between ten or more other Societies, of which the Colonial and Continental Church Society, the Jews' Society, Central African Mission, and the South American Missionary Society stand next in order—"*intervallo proximæ*"—of income and influence. There is happily no apparent symptom of any decline in the interest which is felt in Foreign Missions. The wonder rather is that the paramount claims of Home Missions should be suffered to lag still so far behind. Compare the receipts of the two leading Foreign Missions' Societies for the past year, amounting to £212,000 (C.M.S.) and £134,000 (S.P.G.) with those of our two leading Home Missions' Societies, even when [1] inclusive in either case of moneys locally contributed to meet their grants. £92,000 (C.P.A.) and £78,000 (A.C.S.), and the diminished interest which Home Missions elicit, becomes at a glance painfully apparent. Nor would the enumeration of such special funds as the Bishop of London's Fund, which at the same time appeal to the Church at large, avail to remove this unfavourable impression. If the population of England had assumed anything like a stationary character, such indifference might become more intel-

[1] It is, however, creditable to the candour of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, that she usually *excludes* these sums from the total assigned as her annual income. This reduces C.P.A. to £55,000 and A.C.S. to £42,000.

ligible on the ground that the parishes of England were already mapped out, and due spiritual provision already made thereby for her inhabitants. But such is notoriously the reverse of the case. London alone increases annually by the size of ten large parishes, containing populations of 4,000 apiece, and many a northern Nineveh in similar proportion. The danger is continually incurred of our Foreign Missionary work being undone by the too genuinely home-made heathen, whom our military or commercial enterprise takes abroad. Nowhere has this question of the relative importance of Home and Foreign Missions been handled with greater appreciation than by an eminent novelist, from whom so decided an expression of opinion might perhaps have been little expected. In one of his letters Charles Dickens thus writes:—

> If you think the balance between the Home Mission and the Foreign Mission justly held in the present time, I do not. . . . . I am decidedly of opinion that the two works, the Home and the Foreign, are *not* conducted with an equal hand, and that the Home claim is by far the stronger and the more pressing of the two. Indeed, I have very grave doubts whether a great commercial country, holding communications with all parts of the world, can better Christianize the benighted portions of it than by the bestowal of its wealth and energy on the making of good Christians at home. . . . . For if it steadily persist in this work, working downwards to the lowest, the travellers of all grades, whom it sends abroad, will be good, exemplary, practical missionaries, instead of undoers of what the best professed missionaries can do.—*Charles Dickens's Letters*, vol. i. p. 278.

These considerations are very far indeed from being intended to suggest that we should as a nation withhold anything of our expenditure in behalf of Foreign Missions, in order to level up the deficiencies of our Home Missions. We pride ourselves upon the amount of our contributions to Foreign Missions, but even in this matter the well-merited rebuke of the Archbishop of York is not ill-timed:—

> We may fairly say that when a nation stints its expenditure in any direction, its care for that particular matter is but little. Now what this country spends on Foreign Missions is about half a million annually. Where the treasure is, there the heart is: if we loved more, we should be more liberal.—*Word, Work, and Will*, p. 303.

B. The two next groups of Societies in the above list of six come next to be considered. Literature and Architecture, as they are specialities in the life of any civilized nation, so they are inevitably part and parcel of any well-organized scheme for promoting what is higher than civilization, the claims of Christianity itself. The sphere of either of these two objects is so well-defined in itself, so circumscribed by technical considera-

tions lying out of the every-day beaten track, that it is in the highest degree desirable that each of them should be assigned to specialists, competent to deal with all the varied conditions of the case. Literature and Architecture are, in short, professions in themselves.

a. Churchmen, therefore, have always felt the claims upon them of a Society like the S.P.C.K., which publishes cheap Bibles and Prayer-books at a loss of nearly £10,000 a year, which disseminates tracts and leaflets on every conceivable religious subject, for those whose understandings still require to be fed with milk; while at the same time by its contributions to weighty works on Christian evidences, it provides meat for stronger intellects. To another Society, of which, like the Bible Society, we may truly feel that if it is not exclusively with us, it is emphatically not against us, the admirable Religious Tract Society, we are indebted for such high-toned magazines as the *Leisure Hour* and the *Sunday at Home*. Our high estimate of the relative importance of such literature Societies is counterbalanced by only one rival consideration. The competition now-a-days in the printing trade is such, that printed matter is supplied with much greater cheapness than formerly. The mention of certain firms is a guarantee that their publications will never be unfavourable to religion. This determination on their part to use their influence upon the side of religion, is always certain to secure due consideration for the proffered MSS. of able Christian writers. It becomes a question, therefore, whether the Church would greatly lose if she left the supply of much of her home literature to the ordinary channels of trade. The translation of religious works into foreign languages opens up a totally different and wider question. Undoubtedly the greatest of the benefits rendered by such societies as the S.P.C.K. and the Bible Society, is in the supply of Christian literature, in the vernacular of heathen or semi-Christianized nations.

b. The case is somewhat different with our Building or Architectural Societies. Foremost amongst these stand the Incorporated Church Building Society and the National Society, so far as it helps in the building and furnishing of schools and training colleges. Few persons have had much reason for supposing that competition or any other cause has cheapened the appliances of the builder or the architect. "Ædificat," "he dabbles in bricks and mortar"—was a serious charge against the sanity of a friend in the time of Horace. The wisdom of a modern friend who does not seek for guidance well beforehand in such matters and count the cost, is not even now unimpeachable. Other too than personal considerations render the existence of religious societies for building purposes a matter of importance. A juster sense of architectural taste in an æsthetic age

has prescribed other weighty considerations in our recourse to bricks and mortar for religious purposes. On all these accounts it is well that Societies should exist, not only to assist with grants those who need a new place of worship, or the adequate restoration of an old one, but also to advise on the requirements of religious propriety in architectural matters. The relative importance of Building Societies cannot fail to rank very high in a country where so many new churches still remain to be built for our increasing population. At the same time the enormous sum of £30,000,000, calculated to have been spent upon Church building restoration in the last forty years, holds out some hope that the ground lost by preceding centuries has been made up, and that the expenditure hitherto incurred in dealing with arrears may be diverted more profitably into other channels.

C. a. We can have no hesitation in prescribing what that channel should be. The insufficient incomes of our poorer clergy has long been a serious blot upon a Church which has inherited considerable endowments from preceding ages. No thoughtful person would advocate a system of levelling down, which should end in a monotonous uniformity of livings of equal value; nor would it be wise to ignore the experiences of other religious communities by forgetting the fact that talent is usually secured to a profession by the existence of unequal prizes. But some system of levelling up is plainly needed, when it is remembered that nearly 4,000 livings[1] are of a less value than £200 a year. If it is replied that this object may well be left to the joint operations of two agencies, which do not fall precisely under the description of Religious Societies, Queen Anne's Bounty and the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the answer is ready that the resources of these agencies are far from being inexhaustible, and that in any case an incalculable number of years would elapse before the desired object could be attained. The occasion is one which clearly demands the intervention of that private charity, which has already inaugurated so many other religious Societies. Nor need the carrying out of such a scheme be deemed chimerical. It is calculated that less than the fourth part of the sum quoted above from the return of the House of Lords, as having been spent on Church restoration, would avail to raise every living to a minimum of £200 a year. It was the happy suggestion of the present Bishop of Exeter not long ago, that an age of Church restoration might with advantage be followed by one which should devote itself to increasing the

[1] The union of small contiguous country parishes, which has been ably advocated in Norfolk by Sir T. F. Buxton, Bart., and a redistribution of endowments such as Mr. Childers once advocated in a famous speech on Church Reform at Knottingley, are among other remedial measures which would lessen this evil.—*See* CHURCHMAN, February, 1880, p. 397.

emoluments of the poorer clergy. Unhappily the Society which it is well known was started under the auspices of the Royal family in 1873 with this purpose, has hitherto proved a failure. A significant reason may be assigned for this. The institution of the Marquis of Lorne's Fund seems to mark the point where after high-water mark had been reached by the successive waves of so many preceding Societies, the tide of voluntary zeal at last began to languish and to ebb away. Our regret at this failure is enhanced by the fact that the purposes of this fund were so well conceived, and that ground was taken up by it in a territory hitherto unexplored by any voluntary agency. Happily, in another direction, greater success has attended the efforts of the sister Society, founded by the enterprise of a private clergyman, Rev. J. Halcombe, in 1866, which deals with another department of the same problem of justice to the working clergy. The Curates' Augmentation Fund confines itself to the task of rewarding the longest and most deserving workers among the 5,640 stipendiary curates with an augmentation of £50 a year, after they have been not less than fifteen years in orders, so long as they continue without reproach in harness. We need not expatiate on its need of increased support, if it is to cover the ground at all effectually, which it has marked out for itself.[1]

b. On every account the success of the above group of Societies is ardently to be desired, but on none more than because some simplification of the last group of religious Societies upon our list—the group of clerical eleemosynary Societies—seems eminently desirable. It is questionable whether their existence conduces much to the efficiency of the ministry; they place the clergy in the undignified position of recipients of charity; they cannot fail to encourage the gambling spirit which leads to improvident marriages. Those, again, who benefit directly by them, however deserving in themselves, may well be the widows or children of clergymen who have by no means in their turn deserved well of the Church. Any religious Society must more or less stand self-condemned, which cannot answer to this cardinal test of any such society, Does it tend to

[1] It is sufficient for the purposes of this paper to emphasize as strongly as possible the relative importance of this group of Societies, which concerns itself with the augmentation of the incomes of the poorer clergy. Its writer recognizes it as the first duty of any beneficed clergyman, who finds himself with a nett income of over £300 a year and a population of under 500, and no curate to keep, to tax himself for this purpose with at least the payment of a five-percentage on the excess of his income over that sum. The claims of justice under such circumstances to our less pecuniarily fortunate brother clergymen should surely rank before those of generosity to any other Society.

promote or not the *efficiency* of the Church? Nor should it be forgotten that it is one of the boasts of our Church that she attracts in so large a measure the services of men of some private means. It is doubtful whether she will ever gain much by unduly facilitating the admission into her ranks of needy men.[1]

D. A few Societies may seem to have been left out of sight in the above enumeration. Special evils will from time to time call for the formation of special Societies to watch and to improve the course of public feeling in regard to them, and generally to deal with them as the circumstances of the case demand. The Church of England Temperance Society, at the present moment, supplies a ready instance. The weight which it justly carries in pressing on its remedial measures, both socially and legislatively, is derived from the conviction that it speaks the mind of the collective wisdom, not of this or that part of England, but of the whole Church brought to a focus in its organization. The same consideration marks the point where any other Society whose range is coextensive with the Church, will rise in the scale of real importance above purely diocesan or local societies. When subscribing to the former, the Churchman, who preserves steadily in view a vision of his Church as growing proportionately in every part, may feel a greater confidence that his offerings will be applied on the widest possible survey of the entire ground in those cases where help is most imperatively needed.

DIOCESAN SOCIETIES,—to conclude with a subject broached

---

[1] If the example of the early Church in making provision for the widows of its members is appealed to, this is no argument in favour of placing the maintenance of the widows of ministers of the Church on a higher footing removed from that of ordinary Christian charity, while the altered circumstances of our own time should be remembered, under which insurance societies offer a boon wholly beyond the reach of earlier ages. Upon these grounds the multiplication of Clerical Eleemosynary Societies, many of them on a small scale, and working without concert and overlapping one another, seems much to be deprecated; but no method of superseding them can at all compare with that of straining every effort to see that bare justice is done to the deserving minister while he lives, and so discharging the conscience of the Church from any special obligations beyond those of ordinary Christian charity, to those whom he leaves behind at his death. Until that time arrives, it is anyhow a matter of the first importance, in order to keep a high aim before our poorer clergy, that in considering the claims of widows and orphans, the preference should be given to the claims of such clergymen as have either done the best service to the Church, or whose early promise has been cut off by an unexpected death. The case is somewhat different with the allowances made by most missionary societies to the widow and children of the missionary who labours in unhealthy climates, though even here a glance at the balance-sheets of our missionary societies may well raise the question, whether the expenditure under this head might not be advantageously abridged in favour of some scheme bearing a more direct ratio to the work and value of the missionary himself.

at the beginning of this paper,—so far as they are formed as simply feeders of the great Church Societies, will rest, of course, with them upon the same footing. Where they endeavour to attain kindred objects within their own limited area by separate and independent means, there will always exist some danger of their diverting attention from the wider needs of the whole Church. Nor can those who remit sums of money to the coffers of the headquarters of some central Society in London, with the understanding that it shall be returned to them again for local purposes, be justified in supposing that they have added anything to the general funds of the Church.[1] On the other hand, it must never be forgotten that the needs of some dioceses, like that of Liverpool, are really the crying needs of the Church at large, even though the needs of others assume but slender proportions by comparison.

How to harmonize the claims of the lesser evils, which are at our own doors, appealing for that charity which is justly regarded as beginning at home, with those of the greater evils, which being out of sight may too easily be put out of mind, is a question which must continually exercise the thoughtfulness of Churchmen in general, and of the clergy in particular. It is upon the spirituality—as Coleridge calls the clergy—that liberal but busy laymen will naturally oftentimes depend for information upon the most appropriate methods of meeting the spiritual necessities of their country. By spiritual men ought such spiritual things to be discerned. But the country clergy, whose situation and comparative leisure afford them the best opportunities, too often shrink with a delicacy which might not be so wholly inexcusable, if it were not so detrimental to the interests of the Church, from that positive "duty of mendicancy," which Lord Salisbury has recently pointed out as peculiarly incumbent on them. Sometimes, too, their own acquaintance with the aim and scope of the various Societies is very limited. Sometimes their interest is concentrated exclusively upon but one or two of them. The consequence is, that many a well-disposed but half-informed parishioner, the possessor of some goodly heritage, passes his life in ignorance of the relative claims upon him of the Societies referred to in the foregoing pages. They have been called into existence for the very purpose of redressing these greater evils, which are none the less real because they lie, perhaps, far out of the sight of his happy home, situated in one of the many favoured spots of our island, while his conscience remains too easily satisfied with what he is perfectly ready to

[1] Such is the magical operation of Rule VI. of the Additional Curates' Society, by which, as in the case of Weymouth, sums raised locally for purely local purposes, are reckoned in with the *general* fund of the Society.

do in his own parish and neighbourhood. He is indeed amply justified in that charity which he spends at home, but can he be said to have laid out his many talents to the best advantage, when he remains with his eyes closed to other and equally important claims which exist abroad? Two sets of claims demand reconciliation at the hands of those who are rich in this world, which can only be attained by acting in the spirit of Him, who said, "These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone."

J. Lee Warner.

## Art. V.—OXFORD AND REFORM.

PERHAPS there is nothing more disappointing in the work of the Commission than the very slight attention which has been paid to the needs of undergraduates. Oxford after all exists mainly for its undergraduates, yet what has the Commission done for them? It would be easy to show what has been done for other people. To please the Radicals, clerical headships and fellowships have been abolished; for professors, larger salaries have been secured, and an attempt has been made to find audiences for them; for tutorial fellows, matrimony and a career have been opened. But what has the undergraduate gained? To him it is a matter of profound indifference whether the far-off dignitary whom he so rarely sees, is a clergyman or a layman, whether the professor whose daughters are so engaging, receives £500 or £1,000 for his not very arduous duties. What the undergraduate really wants is, to be properly taught, to pay a fair price for his food and lodging, to have some one to whom he can appeal for advice, perhaps we may add to be kept out of mischief.

As to tuition, the Commissioners seem to have thought that nothing more was wanted than to increase a lecturing staff which is already large enough, if not too large. It is not from dearth of lectures that undergraduates suffer. There was a time when each college prided itself on supplying all its own tuition. Then it often happened that a tutor unfit for his work compelled reluctant undergraduates to listen to him, or at least to sit in his presence. Lectures of this description were no doubt a waste of time, and trying to the patience. But these days are past. Colleges now combine together for tuition, and it seldom happens that an undergraduate reading for honours is compelled to attend a tutor who has nothing to impart. Good lectures are abundant and easily accessible; and complaints of

being overlectured are far more common than complaints of inadequate lecturing.

But, as the unfortunate pupil's pile of notebooks rises higher and higher, an uneasy sensation comes over him that he is sadly unfamiliar with their contents; not merely lazy men, but some of the most painstaking, never learn anything from a system of lectures. While one lecturer contradicts another, one textbook prescribed by authority confutes another, and the textbooks and lecturers are at war with one another, the examination creeps on, and sheer nervousness paralyzes the minds of some who are very far from being stupid men. They are expected to display a *special* knowledge of more subjects than they could have acquired superficially in the time allowed; they are expected to show a *general* knowledge of more subjects than their brain can carry at the same time. And in the midst of all this learning, general and special, they often feel that they *know* nothing. A well-trained competitive candidate fears little, for he has learnt by experience that the secret of success lies in a little information dexterously adapted to the exigencies of the occasion. Much study of examiners' ways has taught him how to make the most of his slender materials. Even he is conscious very often that his store of real knowledge is very slender, and that he is not a well-taught man. While the patient but inexperienced plodder finds himself in a jungle from which only the mercy of the examiners can extricate him. The golden rule *Non multa sed multum* has been set aside at Oxford, and the consequence is that in spite of brilliant lecturing, and endless examining, the ordinary Oxford undergraduate is not a well-taught man.

Although we have hitherto had in mind honour-men principally, much of what has been said applies to the inferior pass-men. For reasons to be indicated presently, the intellectual calibre of such men has not improved in recent years, and efforts have been made to teach them more by requiring them to learn a larger number of subjects. The effort has been only partially successful, because it has been misdirected. Had the standard of admission been raised, schoolmasters must have learnt to make better use of school-time. But this has not been done. With inferior materials to work upon, Oxford tutors have been laboriously trying to produce a better article. They have been endeavouring, upon a more insecure foundation, to raise a larger superstructure, and with the natural result in intellectual edifices, scamped work and much bewilderment. On these points the Commissioners, though warned more than once by witnesses, have not thought fit to legislate: and therefore we say that they have done nothing to secure for undergraduates better teaching.

In the same way the Commissioners, though dealing with college accounts, appear to have done very little towards ascertaining the scale of undergraduate expense at each college, and the precautions (if any) that are taken to secure a fair rate of charges. Possibly so humble a matter as this lay outside their instructions; and they argued that as nobody need go to a college unless he pleased, it was no business of theirs to protect those who might make their own terms. We have no wish at all to see college revenues diverted to pay for the board and lodging of wealthy men, who can well afford to pay for themselves. Some colleges have certainly been generous in bearing burthens for undergraduates, which they need not have borne. But in others it is assumed that all undergraduates are wealthy men, and though the authorities reap no benefit from the extravagance, there is an extravagant style of living and of charges, which bears very heavily on poor men, and specially on scholars. The chief abuse is in the antiquated system of service. A college shoe-black has been known to estimate his place at more than £100 a year, and college cooks have retired on pensions, which were certainly not merited by the dinners which they supplied. There is no question that Keble College by its fixed and low scale of charges has been a benefit to many other than its own undergraduates. Shame, and desire to fill college rooms, have led bursars to attempt feats of reduction, which used to be declared impossible. But in this matter, where simple inquiry would by itself have been beneficial, the Commission has done nothing.

There remains the question of moral supervision. Here we can hardly appreciate the purport of the proposed legislation without weighing carefully the difficulties which had to be faced. Formerly, every undergraduate on arriving at Oxford was assigned to the care of a tutor, who was responsible for his guidance to a very large extent. The tutor gave advice as to lectures which should be attended, the course of reading to be pursued, and was always expected to be ready with friendly counsel and warning as they might be needed. There was, besides the tutor, one or more deans who enforced attendance at chapel, and inflicted punishment for irregularities of conduct. The head of the college never appeared except on grave occasions. At first all, then more than three-quarters, of the undergraduates were expected to live in college. The tutors were bachelors living among the undergraduates, and not in a very different style from them. But this was not the college system which the Commissioners found, nor are parents generally aware, until their sons commence residence, how entirely the old order of things has passed away.

In the first place, many colleges have abandoned the practice of assigning each undergraduate, on his arrival, to a special tutor.

The reason given is that the assignment had become a mere matter of form, as the tutor never saw anything of his pupils except at an occasional breakfast, given often on Sunday morning, out of a sense of duty. Tutors, in fact, had become lecturers, doing a little in the way of private instruction; but all idea of moral or religious guidance had been lost. The change was due partly to the increased amount of lecturing involved by the greater severity of examinations; but we fear that other causes were not wanting, such as an undervaluing of moral as compared with intellectual training; the class-list became the goal of the pupil's ambition, and the end for which the tutor worked.

So largely had this new system been adopted that some colleges were almost deserted by their tutors except during the hours for lecturing. Long before married tutors became common there were loud complaints of the time given by tutors to whist-parties, croquet-parties, visits to London, writing for magazines. These were not, be it remembered, the incompetent idle tutors, but men who were supposed to be the best teachers of their day, because they were the most brilliant writers or speakers. Patient private work was neglected; and moral supervision was supposed to cramp the genius and individuality of the pupil.

Along with moral supervision there perished in many cases the sole relics and survivals of religious teaching. Much, perhaps too much, stress has been laid on this point. No doubt chapel attendance used to be rigorously enforced in old days, whereas it is not as a rule enforced now. But it must not be forgotten that the services were conducted with indecent haste, that irreverent behaviour was hardly checked, and that it must have required what George Herbert calls a "mountain of fire" in the worshipper's heart to receive any benefit from such attendance. Indeed, a strictly logical don has been known to answer an objector to compulsory worship by saying, "Sir, I do not compel you to worship God, but only to be in your place. What you do when you get there is not my concern." At a time when formal lifeless services were supposed to be a pious protest against Methodism, the chapel services were little worse than others. But a better tone of reverence and devoutness spread through the country at large; while Oxford, as a whole, made little change in her chapel services—services read too often by men who privately and in lectures—sometimes even in print—avowed their disbelief in the words which they used as prayers. What mockery could be more profane than that a known unbeliever in the atonement should address our Lord in prayer as having "by one oblation of Himself once offered made a full sacrifice, atonement, and satisfaction for the sins of all mankind." Yet scandals of this nature were so far from being

uncommon in Oxford that they were hardly regarded as scandals among the fellows. In the undergraduate world it was otherwise. The subtle excuses, subterfuges, and reservations which satisfied men accustomed to spend their lives in hairsplitting and metaphysical refinements were to blunt undergraduates nothing but flat falsehoods. On one occasion a lecturer, who had been meandering on to his own satisfaction about the beautiful "mythes" of the Old Testament, was suddenly interrupted by the question, "If these things are all mythes, sir, why do we say in the Ordination Service that we unfeignedly believe them?" It is said that the lecturer began to fumble about for a Prayer-book, while he muttered vaguely "historical sense, you know," and finally dismissed his too simple-minded auditors.

We have passed from chapel services to Divinity lectures, but the transition was inevitable. The two hang together, and the man who displays unbelief in his lecture can hardly hope to impress undergraduates in reading the service. The writer remembers in his college three divinity lecturers. The first kept his class in roars of laughter by quoting mistranslations that he had seen in examination papers. In the interval of these jokes a few notes were read from Alford. All that was original was sceptical. The second can hardly be called a lecturer, for he put off his first lecture, was prevented by a cold from giving the second, sported his oak at the time of the third, and finally hired a country clergyman to take his place. Curiosity brought a fair audience to the poor parson's first lecture, at the second the audience was so meagre that the good man mildly suggested that those who could not come should have sent an explanation, at the third or fourth lecture the college porter carried in a bundle of cards into the empty room where the poor lecturer was waiting. Yet no word of remonstrance was uttered, though the head of the college was a clergyman, and the tutors clergymen. It is hardly wonderful that the dean of this college *punished* undergraduates by making them attend chapels. All these circumstances happened almost twenty years ago, before the abolition of the Tests Act, while Fellows of Colleges were supposed to be all of them members of the Church of England. It was not legislation but unbelief that caused the decay of religious instruction in Oxford.

Presently, that is, some ten years ago, many colleges allowed attendance at roll-call as a substitute for chapel. How ineffective these roll-calls were even as a device for early rising! Left in the hands of a porter or some other underling they became a mere farce. To thrust one's head out of a bedroom window, or to hurry in an ulster coat and slippers across the quadrangle was no proof of early rising: bed was found to be all the sweeter for this slight interruption. A little more method has

been introduced in later years, but there is something very unsatisfactory in the mixed roll-call and chapel system. To avoid chapel is to some men all but a profession of unbelief, they call in arguments to defend what they feel to be an act of irreverence, and a well-disposed lad in his teens turns agnostic sometimes in the course of his first term, as an excuse for constantly turning his back on the chapel door.

It may be objected that all these instances are extreme and exceptional cases, and that they do not fairly reflect the general tone of Oxford. But this is not so. Perfunctory chapels, slovenly Divinity lectures, scandalous irreverence of clergymen, were quite common in Oxford less than twenty years ago, and their opposites were on the whole uncommon. Now there is an improved tone in many colleges. The Honour Divinity school has introduced a better class of lecturers; and again, little as the writer sympathizes with the opinions of Keble College tutors, it is his belief that the marked success of the college made a very decided impression upon Oxford. It was not only the gathering together of a knot of able men with strong religious convictions that gave life and vigour to their action; but, far more than this, the decided preference for religious teaching evinced by English parents was a warning to Fellows of Colleges to set their house in order. They could not afford to despise such a manifest evidence of public opinion.

To secure religious teaching and due performance of chapel services the Commission has proposed, speaking generally, to substitute for Clerical Fellows one or two men, Priests in Holy Orders at the time of their election, who shall be charged with these special duties. Being anxious to secure for these teachers the respect of undergraduates they have as a rule made the Divinity Lecturer a Fellow, or at least given him a place on the governing body. Unfortunately their doing so necessitates his election by the general body of Fellows, of which we spoke in the last Number. But what will this change do for the undergraduate? He can hardly be the loser, so far as religious instruction is concerned, and he may be the gainer sometimes. But we think that the practical value of the change will be exceedingly slight. We cannot hope for much benefit from a teacher chosen by a body utterly unfit to make the choice.

If real pressure is to brought to bear on the colleges it must be looked for in something very different from the statute book. We have already drawn attention to the influence exerted by Keble College in lowering the general standard of expenses at Oxford, and in rebuking irreverence and slovenliness of worship. It was not, we repeat, the few tutors so much as English parents, who, by their confidence in these tutors, impressed the mind of

Oxford. Can anything more be done? Has the Commission left room for any further exercise of this wholesome pressure either by its statutes or by its omitting to legislate.

There is one direction in which this influence can be exerted. Some years ago it was made unnecessary for undergraduates to reside within college walls. They may have either no connection at all with any college, or they may belong to a college but reside in lodgings. One result of this statute has been that colleges have become very sensitive to public opinion. Any *émeute* within college walls which finds its way to the newspapers is soon felt in the matriculation lists. Tutors have been spurred on for their very livelihood to conform to the requirements of public opinion, in all matters which reach or can be known by the outside world. So far the change has been productive of good. Contempt for public opinion, which used to be considered a proof of intellectual vigour, is now more justly regarded as conceit.

On the other hand, it is greatly to be feared that undergraduates have suffered in another direction. Life in lodgings is hardly a safe experiment for grown boys. No doubt there are many, very many, respectable landladies in Oxford, who watch over undergraduates in their houses with all the fidelity of an old family servant. The writer knows many such, and honours them. But it is mere matter of common sense that many will have an eye to money-making before all other considerations, and some will be positively vicious.[1]

---

[1] On this point Dr. Pusey's evidence before the Commission is as follows:—"Either all the founders and all the builders of our colleges have made a great mistake, or we are making a great mistake now, because the manners and morals are certainly not better now than they were when they founded those colleges, or when they built those colleges, and they had that especially as one of the objects in view. I remember in the Oriel College Statutes it was, Let everything, as far as possible, *fiat per mares*. It would not be proverbial, *solus cum sola*, unless there was a great deal in it, and yet the young men must be more or less familiarly waited upon by domestics, and of course a certain degree of intercourse would be necessary not to be uncourteous. You could not let a person come into the room, and say nothing. There is also a disadvantage about the class of servants, because the servants are only terminal servants at each place. Since our vacations are one-half of the year, for the most part they are not the higher sort of maid-servant, because if they could get a place anywhere else they would not take service in a lodging-house. It is said that there has not been any immorality. I should be glad to think that there had not. I have no ground to think that there has been, except human nature; but all the evidence which the curators of them can have, relates to what passes without, but the special danger is that which is in the house, which nobody knows anything about. I do not say that there is immorality, but I say also that there is no evidence that there is not."

This evidence was confirmed in the speech of the out-going Senior

It is here, to our opinion, that the Commission has been most to blame. Not one effort has been made, apparently, to induce colleges to increase the number of their rooms, and so diminish the necessity for lodging-house life. On the contrary, great pains have been taken to strengthen and perpetuate the system of unattached students. Money has been taken from the colleges and applied not merely for extraneous purposes, but actually to assist students *not* to enter colleges. Bribes in the shape of a library, tutors, and scholarships are to be offered out of college revenues against college interests. Apart from the unfairness of the measure, we question its wisdom. There is nothing in the system of unattached students which deserves encouragement. It is not desirable in itself that young men should live in Oxford without friends, without proper supervision, without common life, exposed to many of the worst temptations of the place, and effectually shielded from none. There is nothing to save these students from idleness and extravagance, while there is much to encourage them to far graver faults. Nor is it a sufficient answer that, on the whole, they are a well-conducted body. Of course they are. They are poor men, as a rule, who would not come to Oxford at all, unless they had a serious purpose in doing so: a very large proportion of them look forward to Holy Orders. But are these the men whom it is wise to cast unprotected into Oxford life? who are to be less cared for, less benefited by social intercourse than other men? who are to be studiously kept out of college walls? Why, they are the very men for whose benefit colleges were founded, out of pity for whom, and to make them more profitable to the Church of England, innumerable founders and benefactors piously made provision.

That provision, for the most part, has been alienated. Part has gone to support the study of Natural Science. This declining study is as much the pet of the University now, as ever Theology was in the old days. Thousands of pounds are spent year after year in the University Museum, for which there is nothing to show. No discoveries are made, very little work is done, few students, fewer now than for many years past, are being taught. But on this idle luxury part of the endowments of poor men is annually wasted. Another part has been en-

---

Proctor this year. While speaking well on the whole of undergraduate morals, he distinctly attributed much evil to the lodging-house system. It may be asked, "What proof is there that these evils exist?" Unfortunately, the answer is only too simple. It is enough to know the style of dress and living in many Oxford lodging-houses, and to compare this with the nominal incomes of those who keep these houses. Those who understand Oxford best as citizens, do not hesitate to admit that the evil is great and, alas! increasing.

grossed by wealthy men in the shape of scholarships and prizes. Meanwhile, with the best intentions, but by very unfortunate advice, this Commission has said to these men: "Stay away from the colleges, which were founded for your benefit. Live in dreary isolation. Unlearn nothing of your uncouth manners, and be guided by no advice from elders. Your reward shall be a paring from that which was given for your use. You shall have a bone off the plate, but you must eat it out of doors."

Surely the generosity of the English Church is not yet exhausted. Surely the dangers, may we not say the wrongs, of poor students, will not appeal in vain to the successors of wealthy men in past days. Hitherto almost every great crisis in English history has been marked by a fresh foundation for poor men intended for the ministry of our Church. Merton College and the Baronial wars, New College and the Lollard movement, Corpus, Christ Church, Trinity College, and the Reformation are not merely coincident in time. Dangers threatening to Church and State have been felt as a direct appeal to the faith and piety of God-fearing men. Or is it the case that at this crisis one section only of the Church of England is wise enough to continue, under proper modifications and safeguards, the old time-honoured policy? We are glad to think that it is not so. The munificent benefactor of Hertford College has shown that it is not Ritualists alone who are alive to the existence of a crisis in our Church History.

But we do firmly insist that enough has not yet been done; that a beginning, however modest, should be made, of gathering into collegiate homes during their Oxford life, our future clergy, and poorer laity too. Let one or two houses first of all be placed under a Master of Arts, carefully selected for the purpose. Let him take under his shelter a few poor men, who would otherwise have been unattached students, and give them the benefit of a common though frugal life of kind superintendence, and above all of faithful and scriptural instruction in the principles of our Church. We will answer for it that the attempt, however modestly begun, will meet so urgent a need, that no trumpeting of advertisements will be required to ensure its success. The few houses will grow up into a fair-sized hall, which, by being placed in the hands of trustees, will escape the political birds of prey, who are constantly hovering over the old colleges. Such a hall or halls will serve a double purpose. Not only will the actual residents be protected, instructed, helped forward as they ought to be, but the older colleges will be forced, as in part they have been already, to be less violent or flippant in their anti-religious crusade. There is a party in Oxford, not large as yet, but compact and very determined, which is seeking

to drive out clergy from all educational offices throughout the country. If our Church shows the white feather and does not build up as fast they pull down, our children's children will be educated, not by laymen merely, that were a small matter, but by materialists and atheists.

M.A. OXON.

## ART. VI.—"ALMS AND OBLATIONS."

### A CRITICISM.

THE Dean of Chester contributed an article to the January number of THE CHURCHMAN, drawing out what he considers to be "the true meaning of the phrase" *alms and oblations* "in our book of common prayer"; and my Very Reverend friend has paid me the compliment of inviting my criticism on his arguments. We have often been antagonists in Convocation, —perhaps nearly as often have spoken and voted together—and he most good-naturedly tells me to do my worst, and the Editor, at his request, has very courteously placed these pages at my disposal for the purpose.

In my remarks I shall endeavour to keep within the lines marked out by the Dean, without touching on the doctrinal considerations that underlie the question, and "simply inquire what our prayer book says and means in this particular."

It may be well to clear the way by explaining that the conclusions which I had arrived at many years ago, and as yet have seen no reason to abandon, must not be confounded with the opinion of those who hold that the "*oblations*" of the prayer refer exclusively to the gifts then set on the holy table. It was against them that the Dean's argument was in the first instance directed; and though my disclaimer relieves me from the necessity of meeting a part of his argument, I have to admit that it brings me under the lash of an afterthought which appears as a note in the reprint of his essay:—"Some have thought that the "term oblations in our prayer book includes both the bread and "wine, and also money offerings. This seems to me the worst "theory of all. It has all the features of a helpless compromise, "and is refuted at every turn of the argument."

This is plain-spoken. We, however, have to deal with the proofs. The Dean, no doubt, shows, with great variety of illustration, that *oblatio* in Latin, *oblations* in English, and the "collective phrase" *alms and oblations* were used, both before and after the last revision, of devout gifts for pious and charitable

uses. So far I agree with him; and more than this, I should have to admit that one of his quotations would be most damaging, unless we remembered, that when we call blacks men, we do not mean that whites are not men also. I cannot deny that Sancroft in his visitation articles of 1668 did use *oblations* in the narrower sense for which the Dean contends; and this, sixteen years after it had been otherwise used by the Revisers.

The Dean has proved that *oblations* is used in the sense of devotions or devout gifts; still this does not in any way tend to refute the "helpless compromise." In order to do this and exclude the oblations of bread and wine, it is not enough to have proved that *oblations* was used in some other sense, unless it had also been proved that this exhausted its significance, or, at least, that it could not have been used by the revisers in the sense to which he objects. But the word is of the very largest use, extending from the petty payments, which the law recognizes as due to the parochial clergy, to—with reverence be it spoken—the one Oblation on the Cross; and, inasmuch as it includes what is offered either to God or man, larger than sacrifice offered to God, whether material or otherwise, whether offerings for sin, or sacrifices of thanksgiving. I may add that oblation, according to the received use of this class of words, is employed actively and passively—actively of the manual or verbal act of offering; passively of that which is offered.

The Dean quotes the statutes of his own cathedral as an instance of the use of the Latin *oblatio* before the Reformation, in the restricted sense upon which he insists; but *oblatio* is used in the Vulgate of sacrifices and offerings—as for example, Acts xxiv. 17, Leviticus i. 3; and so too the *oblatio munda*, Malachi i. 11. From this prophecy, no doubt, came the liturgic use of the word. It is used in different forms of the *Ordo Romanus* of the bread and wine, and similarly by the Latin fathers; but I will only borrow from Bishop Bull a single quotation, where St. Augustine is blaming the man who is able to offer, but communicates from out of the oblation of another: "*Oblationes quæ in altari consecrantur offerte, erubescere debet homo idoneus, si de aliena oblatione communicet.*[1]

In the beginning of the ninth century the use of the word, for the bread and wine placed on the altar before consecration, seems to have been so general that, in a capitular of Charles the Great, it was thought necessary to explain that it was also used in the sense to which the Dean would now have us confine it.

Non solum sacrificia, quæ a sacerdotibus super altare Domino

[1] "Discourse on the Sacrifice of the Mass" (1688), p. 46.

consecrantur, sed oblationes fidelium dicuntur, quicquid Ei a fidelibus offeruntur.[1]

But to come to our own country. In Anglo-Saxon times we have one of "the Canons of Ælfric" speaking of the "offrunga" (*oblations of bread and wine*) being set upon the altar.[2] In the coronation office in the "Liber Regalis," *oblatio* occurs in the rubric, where it is appointed that the king shall, by the hands of the celebrant, "place (*imponet*) *oblationem panis et vini.*"[3] In Bishop Lacy's Exeter Pontifical (fourteenth century) we have these same words, but here it is *manibus consecratoris sui.*"[4]

Not to give any more examples from the Latin, in a late service for the consecration of nuns we have the English "oblations."

> After the offertory he (*the bishop*) shall turn to the virgins then professed to receive their oblations, which virgins . . . . then one after another by order, beginning at the eldest, shall offer an host and wine at the bishop's hand for their communion.[5]

I now pass on to the Coronation Service, only remarking that the service at the coronation of Charles II. was in all the main points essentially the same with our present service, and especially as to the Sovereign "offering" the bread and wine, and the subsequent "offering" of a wedge of gold "into the bason."

The coronation took place on the 23rd of April, 1661, the month after the signing of the warrant for the Savoy Conference (25th March).

Of the nine bishops who are named as taking part in the ceremonial (and others were probably present) five were members of the conference, or the Ely House Committee, or both, and therefore will have been witnesses of the King's oblation, the Bishop of Ely (Wren) being the one who "at the King's approach to the altar, delivered unto him bread and wine, which he there offered."

The rubrics of the existing service are as follows:—"*And first the Queen offers bread and wine for the Communion, which. . . . are by the Archbishop received from the Queen and reverently placed upon the altar.*" A prayer is then said, taken from the *Super oblata* of the Pontifical of Anglo-Saxon times, or *Secreta* as the prayer was called when the "Liber Regalis" was written. *Then the Queen, kneeling as before, makes her second oblation, a purse of gold.*

---

[1] Capit. ii. incerti anni, c. xiii., Baluzius, i. 522. This, with a correction of the grammar (*offertur*) was included in the canons of Isaac, Bishop of Langres.—Baluzius i. 1270.

[2] Thorpe, "Ancient Laws," ii. 348.

[3] Maskell, "Monumenta Ritualia," 1846, iii. p. 42.

[4] "Liber Pontificalis," Ed. Barnes, p. 148.

[5] Maskell, "M. R.," ii. 326, 7.

. . . . *And the Archbishop, coming to her, receives it into the bason, and placeth it upon the altar.*"

"*After which the Archbishop says,* O God, . . . . graciously receive these oblations," &c. It may be observed that this prayer is in substitution of the oblatory portion of the prayer for the Church militant, and that "oblations" is in the plural, applying to the *first* oblation of the bread and wine, and the *second* of the purse of gold; just as of old this part of the service was called *oblatio panis et vini et unius marcæ.*[1]

I have now to consider Cosin's Consecration Service. The Dean very justly observes that his authority "if it can be quoted for a point like this, is very worthy of attention." I entirely agree with him; but, inconsistently enough, he discredits his own witness, by charging him with contravening the Prayer Book as received by the Church and Realm; and this on a point where he is altogether to be trusted, and was very probably speaking with a quasi-synodal authority. He quotes the service from Canon Ornsby's "Correspondence of Bishop Cosin," who tells us it was used in 1668. The Dean remarks that we have no means of knowing when it was compiled, but it claims to be "according to the use of the Church of England;" and if I may venture on the conjecture, it is very probably the form which the bishop was commissioned to draw up by the unanimous vote of the united Upper Houses of Convocation on March 22, 166[1].[2]

Certain offertory sentences are appointed to be read. "*Then shall the bishop reverently offer upon the Lord's table the act of consecrating the church. . . . . 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;*" and afterwards "*shall they go on in the service of the Communion*"—the prayer for the Church Militant being no doubt used without leaving out the words *alms and oblations.* The Dean finds in this only an example of *oblations* in the sense Sancroft used it in 1668, and begs the main question by asserting that "the second of these oblations was disallowed by Convocation and Parliament;" that is to say, that it contradicts the Prayer Book. But he says, "We have no reason for believing it was so used as to contradict the Prayer Book." Here I agree with him; but then I, unlike him, see in this rubric a very clear proof that the bread and wine were included in the prayer for the Church Militant. The bishop "offers" them; and according to the sound principle asserted by the Dean under his first head (though I differ from him as to the application he there makes of it), what is offered is an offering, and the words *offering* and *oblation* are synonymous.[3]

[1] Maskell, "M. R.," ii. 42 *n.*

[2] See Cardwell: "Syn. Anglic." 228. Ornsby, note, p. xiv.

[3] The evidence of the Abbey Dore consecration service is still stronger

I have now proved, first, that "*oblations*," according to the received *usus loquendi* both before and after the revision, was used in the sense which the Dean disallows; and secondly, that the Revisers must have been familiar with this use—not that this does prove that they did so use it, though it goes a long way towards it.

I will now examine the several heads of the Dean's argument, so far as they bear upon the question between us. He begins by remarking, under the first head, that at the last revision "some very important and influential members of the Church of England desired that the unconsecrated bread and wine in the communion service should be made an oblation." I shall have occasion to supplement the evidence he here adduces by that of contemporary witnesses as to the feeling within the Church for the restoration of the oblation "in set form and ceremony." I may now first point out some confusion in the description of the three "prayer books with manuscript notes," as it affects the accuracy of the Dean's inference from them.[1]

The earliest, or Durham Book, is rightly described as containing Bishop Cosin's preliminary notes. They are in his own writing, with some corrections in Sancroft's hand. The second, preserved in the Bodleian, is hardly described correctly as containing Sancroft's preliminary notes, although they are in his handwriting. We hear of him afterwards as Archbishop and Confessor; but at this time he was Cosin's chaplain and ama-

in my favour, whilst the words I mark in capitals seem to make more for the distinction as to the restricted use of *oblations* than any instances the Dean has brought forward, not excepting the one he quotes from Bishop Wren himself. The church was consecrated by Bishop Field in 1635 under a commission from Wren, then newly consecrated to the See of Hereford. Mr. Fuller Russell printed the service from a MS. in the British Museum. At the offertory, after the sentence "Let your light so shine," &c., the bishop "*offers and lays upon the table, first his act of consecration.*" He "*likewise layeth on the table*" certain conveyances in law for the erection and dotation of the church and rectory. "*Then . . . the bishop offereth* [the bread and wine] *also.*" "*The priest treatably proceedeth to read other of the sentences especially those that are* FOR THE OBLATIONS AND NOT FOR THE ALMS—*viz., the 2nd, the 6th . . . . &c.*" "*All this while the chaplain standeth before the table, and receiveth the oblations of all that offer.*" It will be seen that the name "oblations" is given only to the money offerings; but as the parchments, and the bread and wine also were *offered*, they were "oblations" according to the Dean's own showing. The prayer is for the acceptance of "*oblations*," not "*alms*," the word alone authorized in the ordinary service as then prescribed in the prayer book.—"Form of the Consecration of the Parish Church of Abbey Dore" (1874) p. 27.)

[1] As the Dean mentions he did not know it had been done, he will be pleased to know that these books have been brought together, and every minute particular noted and recorded, with all the care he can have desired, by Mr. James Parker in his "Introduction to the Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer."

nuensis, though that position may very well have given him an opportunity of "pleading earnestly for" and "strongly urging" alterations he desired, which the Dean mentions that he did, upon some authority I have not had the advantage of examining, and he has not happened to specify.

This second book — the "Sancroft's Fair Copy," of Mr. Parker—contains the *secundæ curæ* of Cosin, in the form in which, as I have been in the habit of regarding it, he presented them to the Bishops' Committee at Ely House.

As I understand the question, the third, or photozincographed book, is the result of the Bishops' deliberations, as noted by Sancroft, with a summary[1] of the alterations and additions drawn up by Bishop Nicholson, the junior bishop on the committee. It was in that form presented to the Upper House, and certain amendments were afterwards entered in it, as they were resolved upon in the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation. It was practically the official copy, and appears to have been so considered in the council chamber, and both Houses of Parliament;[2] but the Dean is mistaken in supposing that it was the book "which was subscribed by the Convocations of Canterbury and York, and annexed to the Act of Uniformity." The book so subscribed and annexed was in manuscript, "out of" this "fairly written."[3]

The Dean quotes from Cosin's "preliminary notes" (the book now in Cosin's library at Durham) the rubric there noted by him for the oblation of the bread and wine. In this certain erasures were made, but the rubric, as modified by him in Sancroft's corrected copy, still suggests "the priest shall then offer up and place upon the table" as in the Scotch book. The words "*offer up and*" were not adopted by the Ely House Committee. The rubric, as amended by them, is entered by Sancroft in the photozincographed book, and was passed by both Houses of Convocation without alteration. The Dean tells us, as noted above, that the phrase was "strongly recommended both by Cosin and Sancroft," but nevertheless "decisively rejected;" and he thereupon jumps to the conclusion that "the present rule embodies the deliberate rejection of a proposal that the placing of the bread and wine should be made an oblation."

Cardwell[4] also laid great stress upon the omission of this word "offer"; and no doubt the objection proceeds upon the supposition that it is the only operative word of the rubric in so far as it recognizes the manual act as an act of oblation. But this seems to be an entire mistake. "Place" is, or at all events

---

[1] "Facsimile," pp. 3-6.
[2] "Journals, H. L.," xi. 393, 409; "H. C.," viii. 406.
[3] "Journals, H. L.," xi. 426.
[4] "Conferences," 382.

represents, the word that in our own and other languages has been used from the first for *setting on* the Lord's table the gifts which man drew near to offer. The rubrical use of *offert* in this connection is a Roman peculiarity. It was new to any Anglican use, but was adopted in the Scotch book—not that for one moment I allow the justice of the sectarian invective that was heaped upon its framers as "Papists in disguise," "fautors of superstition," and so forth. In so far as the charge of Romanizing did apply to them, it is but one of those many examples where, for want of better information, men (in those days as in the present) honestly opposed to distinctive Roman doctrines nevertheless are too apt to take Rome at her word as the witness to Catholic tradition on other points, especially of ceremonial and ritual, and accept Roman use, often recent Roman use, as a true survival of antiquity.

But to return to the "deliberate rejection." It seems to me that the rubric as altered does direct an act of oblation, and that the bishops may have had reasons for considering it more suitable for the purpose than the form proposed by Cosin, which they did not adopt, or, as the Dean prefers the phrase, they rejected.[1] What their reasons may have been must be entirely matter of conjecture; but the instructions of the Savoy Conference were morally binding on them. It was required to

"advise upon and review the book of common prayer, comparing the same with the most ancient liturgies which have been used in the Church in the primitive and purest times;" to "make such resonable and necessary alterations . . . . as shall be agreed upon as needful or expedient for the giving satisfaction unto tender consciences, . . . . but avoiding as much as may be all unnecessary alterations in the form and liturgy wherewith the people are already acquainted, and have so long received in the Church of England."[2]

Of the eight bishops on the Ely House Committee, Sheldon, Cosin, and Morley had been members of the Savoy Conference; and though that unhappily had come to nothing, they could not have had a better guide than the prudent and charitable principles laid down for its guidance. The mere name of the Scotch book was an offence to a large party favourable to the restoration in church and state; and the bringing back of the oblation had been singled out for special denunciation. The bishops certainly did not object to the primitive doctrine. Wren, as we have seen, had sanctioned the use of "offer" in the consecration

[1] It must be remembered that Cosin proposed "another method" with a prayer of oblation as in Edward VI.'s first book; but, as noted in Sancroft's handwriting at the bottom of the page, "My Lords, the Bishops at Ely House ordered all in the old method."—See Cosin, "Works," v. 518; Parker, "Introduction," p. ccxxii.

[2] See Warrant, Cardwell, "Conferences," 300.

service at Abbey Dore. Cosin afterwards introduced it in the consecration service he was commissioned to prepare, or at least used, in 1668; and all of them must have sanctioned it by their presence at the coronation a few months before, or in any case have been familiar with its use in the service.

How then did they deal with the rubric so as to retain its purpose, and not endanger its acceptance by Convocation or Parliament? The first book of Edward VI. used the old English "*set on*" and (as their warrant suggested though the Dean,[1] puts "earlier liturgies" aside) they turned to the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, perhaps not without a side-glance at the "*ponat*" of the Sarum use, and the "*componat*" of the Ebor. They would there have found, *καὶ ὁ μὲν ἱερεὺς ἀποτίθησι τὸ ἅγιον ποτήριον ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ τραπέζῃ*—"*And the priest shall set (place) the holy cup on the holy table.*" And so too of the dish, which, and not a paten, is used in the Eastern Church, for the holy loaf: *Τὸν δὲ ἅγιον δίσκον . . . . ἀποτίθησι καὶ αὐτὸν τῇ ἁγίᾳ τραπέζῃ.* "*And the holy dish . . . . he shall also set it upon the holy table.*"

And where do we find the authority of the Eastern Church for their rubric with its "place" and "table"? Where least of all some objectors would expect to find it—in the words of the Old Testament in their Septuagint version:—

*Καὶ ἐπιθήσεις ἐπὶ τὴν τραπέζαν ἄρτους ἐνωπίους ἐναντίον μου διαπαντός.*—Exodus xxv. 30. In our authorized version, "And thou shalt set upon the table shewbread before me always." In the Vulgate, "Et pones super mensam."

The bishops omitted the "*offer up,*" which was modern and unnecessary—retain the "*place,*" which we have seen is the *verbum sollemne,* and give us the words of our present rubric.

Under the second head, there is nothing as to the narrower question between us; but under the third the Dean contrasts the rubric for the oblation of the alms with that for the oblation of the bread and wine, which we have just been considering, to the great advantage of the former; and no doubt it is very unlike the old style of rubric, which simply directs something to be done. He dilates upon its *reverently bring,* and *humbly present,* and the "sermon" it preaches. But of the other he says, "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.*'" Its simplicity may be a recommendation to some of us, less inclined to be impressed by the sententious expletives of the Laudian period, and the reminiscence of an ill-timed lesson forced upon reluctant Episcopalians. But we know the proverb, and in matters of feeling there can be no

[1] The Churchman, p. 264.

argument, *non disputandum.*—Still I cannot help noticing the Dean's question, when he asks, "Is it credible, if the placing of the bread and wine on the table was intended to be received as a solemn offering to Almighty God, that language would be used so *bare and mean?*" The shewbread has been regarded as especially prefiguring this aspect of the Eucharist: it was an unbloody sacrifice, or pure offering, on behalf of the whole Jewish people, in a state of acceptance by reason of the atoning blood of the typical victims. I will not ask the Dean whether this "most holy of the offerings of the Lord" can be viewed as a solemn offering to Almighty God.

I know him too well to suggest that he would have used these unworthy epithets, if for one moment he had thought the terms of the rubric might be so nearly identical with the word of God; and I will not ask him whether the language of the inspired rubric, so to speak, of the shewbread, is "bare and mean;" but I do ask wherein it is less bare or less mean than our rubric, which I have shown may be traced upward through "the most ancient liturgies," to which the Revisers were referred, and to be moulded in the very words of Exodus. I do ask wherein it is more mean, or more bare than the rubrics directing other things to be done in "the Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper:" "*He shall say the prayer of consecration.*" . . . . "*Here the priest is to take the paten into his hands.* . . . . "*and here to break the bread;*". . . ."*and here to lay his hand upon all the bread;*". . . . and so of others.

Under his fourth head the Dean brings forward an objection as to the bread and wine being *provided at the charges of the parish,* and he claims the support of two well-known scholars, whose opinions are entitled to every respect. To this I will answer by again appealing to the law of the shewbread. Was this less an "offering of the Lord" because it was taken "from the Children of Israel by an everlasting covenant;" and not provided by the free-will offering of individual Jews; or were other national sacrifices less offerings before the Lord, because they were provided from the half shekel that was taken from the Children of Israel and appointed "for the service of the tabernacle of the congregation."

The fifth and sixth heads bring forward examples of the use of *oblations* in one sense which I quite allow, although, as I have already said, I am not prepared to admit that the word cannot be used in other senses, which do not, as the Dean supposes, "utterly separate the term from all connection with the bread and wine."

Under the seventh head the Dean undertakes to show how "parallelism becomes contact also." He is a Cambridge man, and a wrangler, and it would be presumptuous in me to question

his ability so far as geometry is concerned; but I do question his logic, or at all events his accuracy in quotation. It would seem that he trusted to his memory; and his mistake reveals a misconception, which may account for much of the inconsequence I seem to trace in his reasoning. He says:[1] "In the rubric before the prayer for the Church Militant, we find "alms and other devotions;" in the prayer itself, "alms and oblations." If this quotation had been correct, it might have counted for something towards the contention that by *oblations* we ought to understand no more than "other devotions." He tells us in his prefatory remarks that though "the sums of money collected from the congregation and solemnly presented, are literally *oblations*, they are not, in all cases, literally *alms*." The Dean has taken *alms* for *alms for the poor*, much as charity has been limited in the same way. He has referred us to his statutes; and if he will examine the muniments of his own or other cathedrals and ecclesiastical corporations in general, he will find grants of land for the fabric fund, for endowments and other "*pious uses*," in *franc-almosne, in liberam eleemosynam, in perpetuam eleemosynam*, and so forth. The Revisers understood *alms* in this larger sense, and accordingly the rubric does actually run, "alms for the poor and other devotions"—these being co-ordinate species of alms; and the offertory sentences, if not "an expression of the parallelism," at all events bear witness to the logical division. In accordance with this larger use of *alms*, the "*alms for the poor*" in the marginal rubric of 1552 becomes *alms* in that of 1661, and a new rubric is added as to the disposal of the "money given at the offertory to pious and charitable uses."

Here, then, we have one of two distinct series; and we may notice that it tallies in every point of the Dean's parallel lines, and includes all and more than all that was included in the injunctions quoted by him, or in the Prayer Book as it stood before the revision.

There is a second distinct series of rubrics corresponding with the other, as to the provision of the bread and wine; the placing on the table; the alteration of the marginal rubric by the mention of *oblations;* and the distinction as to what remained of them after communion, as it was consecrated or unconsecrated —as to which I need only here say that I cannot agree with the Dean in ignoring them, at least so far as the changes made at the revision bear upon the significance of *oblations* as then added to the prayer for the Church Militant.

Upon the eighth head, I will only remark that whilst I quite allow that the alterations made at the revision were for the

[1] THE CHURCHMAN, 262, Essay, 11.

promotion of order and reverence, I should be disposed to attribute to them a doctrinal significance and origin, which is outside the terms of our present inquiry.

The Dean attaches great importance to the argument under his ninth head. I entirely agree with him as to "the formula" being used entire, when used at all, and fully admit that when there is not a communion, "oblations" in the prayer cannot apply to the oblations of bread and wine, which are not there —but "when there is a communion," they are there, they are placed on the table, and, as I think I prove, they are included in the prayer for acceptance. The Dean says "it would have been quite easy to say; *If there be no communion, then shall the word oblations be omitted;*" but that would have been to imply that alms offered before the Lord are not oblations, and I, for one, hold that they are, whether intended for pious or charitable uses; and I hold this quite as strongly as I hold that the prayer was altered, primarily, but not exclusively, with reference to the oblation of bread and wine.

Here, in the reprint of his essay (*page* 14) the Dean appends a note in which he puts the case of "a communion without money offerings of any kind;" and he adopts an opinion that—

> In this case the minister has no authority for the use of the words "alms and oblations" in whole or in part; not in whole, because no alms have been collected; not in part, because he has no right to use the word "oblations," and to omit the word "alms."

So far we must all agree. In the communion of the sick the rubric requires the minister to leave out the offertory and the prayer for the Church Militant; and no provision is made for a case of public administration of the Lord's Supper, where priest and people alike appear before the Lord empty.

And what does this prove? I have fully admitted the severity of the Dean's afterthought against those of us who do not accept the meaning of *oblations* in the sense of his decision; but I cannot allow that he adds "force" to his argument, as he seems to imply, by his *esprit d'escalier* in this last instance. We are not forced to admit, either that the Revisers "separated *oblations* from all reference to the unconsecrated elements;" or else that they failed in "care and exactitude."

They did neither the one nor the other. They were practical men, legislating, or rather proposing legislation, for practical purposes. They were not speculative casuists, and therefore they did not provide for a case, which I am very sure has never occurred within the Dean's own experience; and most probably not in that of any clergyman of our communion. They cannot have thought it conceivable that in a congregation where the rubric contemplated deacon, churchwarden, or other

fit person to receive the alms, and at least three or four to communicate with the priest, there would not be found one at the least with somewhat of the spirit of a certain poor widow, who cast her two mites into the treasury.

Under this head the Dean appeals to "church authority." The question between us is rather as to how we read language that has the authority of the church; and if, for my part, I do not claim its decision, I will not dispute the Dean's right to a *consensus* of nonconformist authority. It counts for something in favour of mine being the straightforward explanation, that those who have left the church, have decided to alter its language as it stands into unmistakable accordance with the Dean's gloss upon it. The so-styled "Reformed Church of England" have struck out the rubric for the oblation of the bread and wine, and the word *oblations* in the prayer. The Wesleyan Methodists retain the full phrase "*alms and oblations*," but restrict its meaning to alms "*for the poor*," by modifying the first rubric, and omitting the second as to the bread and wine. The "Book of Common Prayer for Evangelical Churches" removes "*oblations*" from the prayer, and expunges both rubrics. Here we have three different solutions of the Dean's problem—all arriving at his conclusion, but all, of set purpose, rejecting his hypothesis.[1]

I have now reached the Dean's tenth and last head. My contention is not directly concerned with his observations as to the "theory which *identifies* oblations with the unconsecrated bread and wine," but in reference to his remark as to its contradicting history, is he quite sure that his own theory, which identifies them with the alms in the bason, is consistent with historical facts he has not taken into consideration?

In the Prayer Book of 1549 a rubric directed the priest to set both the bread and wine upon the altar. In 1552 this was removed, and in the prayer which we know as the prayer for the Church Militant (though it is called "the general prayer" in our rubric) a petition was inserted, in the words we now have, "to accept our alms." By this, as far as an inference from what they did justifies us in hazarding a suggestion as to

[1] The Church of Ireland in its new Prayer Book has gone half-way to meet objectors by giving the priest the option either to place the bread on the table at some other time, than immediately before the prayer, or to leave this to be done by any one else. The Reformed Church in Spain gives the same option. It varies from our English and the Irish books (which, with the addition of features derived from the old Mozarabic liturgy, it follows for the most part) by describing the "oblations of the faithful" (*ofrendas de los fieles*) as "the oblation of the (*our*) alms" (*la ofrenda de nuestras limosunas*) in the prayer that follows, and pains seem to have been taken to eliminate from it all reference to an oblation of the "gifts of bread and wine"—"Oficios Divinos y Administracion de los Sacramentos en la Iglezia Española." Madrid. 1881.

what they intended, the Revisers of that day meant to exclude any offering by the Church in the Lord's Supper other than alms and prayers—and so for more than a hundred years the Reformed Church of England had no prescribed oblation of the bread and wine.

In the absence of any direction, some—probably the many—followed the ritual of private masses in the placing of the elements on the altar at the beginning of the office, which the first book of Edward VI. had guarded against; and others, though it subjected them to remark, retained the formal oblation.

Field had alluded to the subject in his work "Of the Church"[1] but it would seem that Mede, some years later, was the first to arouse general attention to it. In his argument for the oblation of the bread and wine, he answers the question:—

Is not our celebration of the Eucharist defective where no such oblation is used? I answer, this concerns not us alone but all the Churches of the West of the Roman communion, who as in other things they have depraved this mystery, and swerved from the primitive pattern thereof, so have they for many ages disused this oblation of bread and wine and brought in, in lieu thereof, a real and hypostatical oblation of Christ himself. This blasphemous oblation we have taken away, and justly; but not reduced again that express and formal use of the other. Howsoever, though we do it not with a set ceremony and form of words, yet in deed and effect we do it, so often as we set the bread and wine upon the Holy Table. For whatsoever we set upon God's Table is *ipso facto* dedicated and offered unto Him, according to that of our Saviour (Matt. xxiii. 19); the altar sanctifies the gift, that is, consecrates it unto God, and appropriates it to His use.—*Works*, 1648, p. 520.

Patrick, in his "Mensa Mystica," which was written some two years before the Restoration, says:—

The spiritual sacrifice of ourselves and the corporal sacrifice of our goods to him may teach the Papists that we are sacrificers as well as they, and are made kings and priests unto God. Yea, they may know that the bread and wine of the Eucharist is an offering (out of the stock of the whole congregation) to this service, according as it was in primitive times: when (as Justin saith) they offered bread and wine to the προεστὼς, chief minister of the brethren, who took it and gave praise and glory to the Lord of the whole world and then made ἐπὶ πολὺ, a large and prolix thanksgiving to him that had made him worthy of such gifts.[2]

After the Revision he added the following sentence: "We pray him therefore in our communion service to accept our

[1] Ed. 1849, vol. ii. p. 66.
[2] "Mensa Mystica," 1660, p. 43.

oblations (meaning those of bread and wine) as well as our alms."[1]

Ten years after the Revision, Patrick published his "Christian Sacrifice," where he speaks in the same sense:—

> You see the bread and wine set upon God's table by him that ministers in this Divine Service. Then it is offered to God, for whatsoever is solemnly placed there, becomes by that means dedicated and appropriated to Him.[2]

And afterwards, though here I do not agree as to the exclusive sense of oblations:—

> These (*alms and oblations*) are things distinct; and the former (alms) signifying that which was given for the relief of the poor; the latter (oblations) can signify nothing else but (according to the style of the ancient Church) this bread and wine presented to God.[3]

My only other witness within the Church must be Hamon L'Estrange, who wrote before the Restoration:—

> The first (division of sacrifices and oblations) is the bringing of our gifts to the altar, that is, the species and elements of the sacred symbols, and withal some overplus, according to our abilities, for the relief the poor.[4]

Nor was this opinion confined to lay and ordained members of the Church. Baxter, that most resolute of Nonconformists, held similar opinions very strongly;[5] and, like Cosin and Wren, had prepared a form for insertion in the Liturgy, but was overruled before it was presented to the Commissioners at the Savoy, as he tells us himself:—"When the brethren came to examine the reformed Liturgy, and had oft read it over, they past it at last in the same words I had written it, save only that they put out a few lines in the administration of the Lord's Supper, where the word offering was used."[6]

In conclusion, let me ask—When the question was so prominent, is it probable that the bishops by inadvertence, or in

---

[1] "Mensa Mystica," 1674, p. 38.

[2] "Christian Sacrifice," 13th edition, 1708, p. 77. This was the year after his death, he being then Bishop of Ely, and his explanation is all the more important as contemporary evidence, when we remember that he had taken a leading part in the Royal Commission of 1689 for preparing amendments in the Liturgy to be presented to Convocation. It proposed no alteration in the rubric, except substituting *minister* for *priest* (as in 1552), and none in the oblatory portion of the prayer for the Church Militant. In this point of view the evidence of Bishop Burnet to the same effect is also of importance. See as to "the oblation of the bread and wine," "Articles," Oxford, 1831, p. 473.

[3] "Christian Sacrifice," p. 78.

[4] "Alliance of Divine Offices," 4th edit., p. 271.

[5] "Christian Directory," III., 98, iv. 1.

[6] "Reliquiæ Baxterianæ," I., 334.

ignorance of their import, would have recommended words that, to say the least, are capable of bearing the sense for which I contend? Or would Convocation have accepted them? And can we believe that upon the Dean's view of the scope of the alteration they would have challenged attention[1] for the sake of admonishing us that the offering of our substance is to be viewed as a sacrifice to Almighty God, when the form already contained a supplication for the acceptance of the alms and prayers "which we offer unto God's Divine Majesty?"

I think not. Richard Baxter's brethren were not the only men then who objected to "offering," word and thing. After the Revisers' proposals became law, their work was attacked and defended on the ground that the Prayer Book now taught an oblation in the Lord's Supper; but it was reserved for objectors of a later generation to explain away the received construction of its words.

We have seen the way in which other bodies have dealt with them—omitting or modifying one or both of the rubrics, or expunging the word *oblations*,—and I think we may fairly ask how many of those who think with the Dean within our Church would wish to "lay a sacred hand" upon the alms by calling them oblations, if the word were not already in the prayer? or how many would hesitate to do so as those others have done, if they had the opportunity?

I have produced contemporary evidence. I might have wound up with a whole catena from works of divines and charges of bishops from that time to the present, but I must be content with a few words of Archbishop Longley, spoken, as it were, from his grave:—

> The only distinct oblation or offering mentioned in that office [*of the Holy Communion*] is previous to the consecration of the elements, in the prayer for the Church Militant, and therefore cannot be an offering or sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ.[2]

And now as to the Dean's summing up. He does not spare those who differ from him. He impugns our honesty "of dealing with the plain letter of the Prayer Book." He condemns the Revisers "of doing very loosely and carelessly," unless indeed they took "the view of the meaning of the word oblations" which he presents. Still there are those who thank God that they did remove the reproach laid upon our reformed Church for more than a hundred years. They brought back to our Liturgy a witness to the truth, against unscriptural development and mediæval corruption, in the eucharistic sacrifice of the Apostles' times, with its visible and vocal oblation. They neither com-

[1] "Facsimile," p. 5. [2] [Posthumous] "Charge," 1868, p. 25.

posed a homily nor framed a canon under guise of revising the Prayer Book, but they did give us well-considered words—simple in themselves and pregnant in their meaning—words that are sufficient for their purpose, and still are, as from the first, *φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσιν.*

T. F. SIMMONS.

NOTE.—An objection is raised—not by the Dean in his argument against the recognition of an oblation of the "creatures" of bread and wine—but by some, who—the better to urge the acceptance of the Roman doctrine of sacrifice in the Mass—deny or depreciate the eucharistic character of our service. It is, that by the offering of the oblations and prayers *sub uno*, as liturgiologists express it, we deprive it of all reality and significance.

I may not discuss the doctrinal question, but—*ad hominem*—I answer that we have examples of a similar conjoining of signs visible and vocal in Eastern and Western liturgies, and examples that I can well believe the revisers had in view when they used oblations in the sense I contend they did.

In the "First Prayer of the Faithful," in the liturgy of St. Chrysostom, they pray that God will make them worthy of offering to Him prayers and supplications and unbloody sacrifices —*τοῦ προσφέρειν σοι δεήσεις καὶ ἱκεσίας καὶ θυσίας ἀναιμάκτους.*

In the old coronation office (and there are *secretæ* in the modern Roman Missal to the same effect), we have "*Suscipe, Domine, preces et munera ecclesiæ tuæ,*" &c.

A somewhat similar objection has been raised in reference to the joining together of alms for the outward needs of man and gifts to God as signs of inward devotion, as if it were derogatory to the latter. It has, however, the sanction of St. Paul before Felix: "I came to bring alms to my nation and offerings," Acts xxiv. 17. Here he joins the alms of which he was the bearer, not, indeed, with the pure offering of the New Testament, but either with the ordinary offerings at the feast of Pentecost, or with the special offerings of the Nazarite that were enjoined by the Mosaic law.

T. F. S.

# Short Notices.

*The Quarterly Review.* No. 306. John Murray.

The current number of the *Quarterly* did not reach us till the May CHURCHMAN was nearly all printed. It is an excellent number; and on two or three articles which specially interested ourselves, we should gladly make remarks: *e.g.*, The Life of Swift (for which we shall have another opportunity); English Poets; Mr. Lecky's XVIIIth Century; and a statesmanlike answer to the question, What shall be done with Ireland?" But our notice of this *Quarterly* must be simply a notice of its first article, in which the Text of Drs. Westcott and Hort is dealt with by the eminent critical scholar to whose previous articles we have gladly asked attention (*Quarterly Review*, Nos. 304, 305).

"Westcott and Hort's Textual Theory" is one of the ablest articles we ever read; in its way, indeed, on such a subject, it stands alone. The writer of it, as everybody knows, speaks with peculiar authority; and the raciness, point, and vigour of his style are irresistible. Most of our readers, probably, will at least "run through" the article; and many will study it with enjoyment. Extracts from it, therefore, are here uncalled for. The Reviewer examines the "Theory" and the arguments adduced in support of it: he shows what Dr. Hort's contention actually is. He says:—

> The one great fact, which especially troubles him and his joint Editor,—(as well it may)—is *the traditional Greek text* of the New Testament Scriptures. Call this text Erasmian or Complutensian,—the text of Stephens, or of Beza, or of the Elzevirs,—call it the "Received," or the *Traditional Greek Text*, or whatever other name you please;—the fact remains, that a Text *has* come down to us which is attested by a general consensus of ancient Copies, ancient Fathers, ancient Versions. Obtained confessedly from a variety of sources, this text proves nevertheless to be essentially *one and the same* in all.

"In marked contrast to the Text we speak of (which is identical with "the Text of every extant Lectionary of the Greek Church, and may there-"fore reasonably claim to be spoken of as the *Traditional* Text), is *that* "contained in a little handful of documents of which the most famous are "Codices B ℵ and the Coptic Version (as far as it is known), on the one "hand,—Cod. D and the old Latin copies on the other." To magnify the merits of these "documents," and to ignore their defects, continues the Reviewer, has been the practice of the dominant school of Textual Critics for the last fifty years. But Drs. Westcott and Hort have gone beyond Lachmann, Tregelles, and Tischendorff. They shut us up within narrow limits. This is our fate: (1) Codices B and ℵ with (2) Drs. Westcott and Hort's "Introduction" and "Notes on Select Readings" in vindication of their contents!

The *Quarterly* protests further, that ℵ is even more corrupt than B, and that the deference paid to these two MSS. is a weak superstition; arguing for a more excellent way, he thus proceeds:—

> For, let the ample and highly complex provision which Divine Wisdom hath made for the effectual conservation of His written Word be duly considered; and surely a recoil is inevitable from the strange perversity which in these last days would shut us up within the limits of a very few documents, to the neglect of all the rest,—as though a revelation from Heaven had proclaimed that the Truth is to be found exclusively in *them*. The good Providence of the Author of Scripture is discovered to have furnished His household, the Church, with

(speaking roughly) 1,000 copies of the Gospels:—with twenty Versions—two of which go back to the beginning of Christianity: and with the writings of a host of ancient Fathers. *Why* out of those 1,000 MSS. *two* should be singled out by Drs. Westcott and Hort for special favour,—to the practical disregard of all the rest: *why* Versions and Fathers should by them be similarly dealt with,—should be set aside in fact in the lump,—we fail to discover. Certainly the pleas urged by the learned editors can appear satisfactory to no one but to themselves.

The Reviewer's more excellent way is to inquire WHICH FORM OF THE TEXT HAS THE FULLEST, THE WIDEST, AND THE MOST VARIED ATTESTATION. His observations on this method seem to us thoroughly sound.

We may add that the *Quarterly* comments on the Syrian Recension and other theories, unsupported by evidence and on "personal instincts" or "personal discernment" (Introduction, p. 65), are excellent. The lack of evidence is brought before us as we read the interesting pamphlet (published by Messrs. Macmillan and recommended in the *Times*) in defence of the text of the R.V. To refer us to the Introduction of the two Cambridge Professors is very well; but we have searched that volume for testimony in support of theory, and our search has been in vain.

*Tenth Annual Report of the South-Eastern Clerical and Lay Church Alliance, on the Principles of the Reformation, for* 1881. Together with the Annual Statement of Accounts and Report of the South-Eastern College, Ramsgate; the Eighth Report of the Church Deaconess-Home, Maidstone; a Sermon on Deaconesses, by the Dean of Canterbury; and Prospectus of Union of Lay and Clerical Associations. Maidstone: W. S. Vivish, 28, King Street. 1882.

We have given the title-page of this very interesting *Report* at full length.[1] The title-page shows what are the Contents; and we can promise our readers that this publication of about a hundred and twenty pages will well repay reading. As the question of Lay and Clerical Associations is of no small importance at the present moment, we may quote the "General Statement" with which the Report opens:—

"The Alliance aims at no doctrinal changes in the Articles or Liturgy " of the Church of England, but rather seeks to vindicate her formularies " from misunderstanding or misconstruction, and to maintain in its " integrity the Scriptural teaching which is embodied in them.

" With uncompromising adherence to the doctrine of the Atonement, " and the whole truth of the Gospel, and desiring to maintain as far as " possible a large-heartedness of character, a spirit of forbearance in " matters non-essential, and an abundant sympathy with the difficulties " of inquiring minds, the Alliance proposes the following objects, prin- " ciples, and plan of operation.

" OBJECTS—

" 1. Doctrinal purity.

" 2. Spiritual vitality and holiness of living.

" 3. The reformation of abuses in the Church, together with the intro- " duction of such practical arrangements as may suit the varying wants " of the age.

" PRINCIPLES—

" Sincere and loyal attachment to the true principles of the English " Reformed Church, as distinguished on the one hand from doctrines and " practices of a Romanizing tendency, and from the Rationalistic free " handling of Revelation on the other.

" The upholding of the truth in the spirit of peace and charity.

[1] Omitting only that the price is one shilling.

"PLAN OF OPERATION—

"I. Prayer, united, and at stated times, and for stated purposes.

"(1) For the Church, especially for an increase of able Ministers of "the New Testament.

"(2) For Members of the Alliance.

"(3) For Perverts and those in danger of perversion.

"II. The Press.

"By the investigation of books and publications, with the view of "giving information on matters of interest to the Members.

"III. Friendly correspondence and co-operation with societies esta- "blished on similar principles, and such other means as may from time "to time be approved of by the Alliance.

The President of the South-Eastern Clerical and Lay Church Alliance is the Dean of Canterbury: among the Vice-Presidents are the Revs. F. S. C. Chalmers, H. B. W. Churton, J. E. Campbell-Colquhoun, Archdeacon Dealtry, J. Deacon, Esq., Canon Scott-Robertson: the Hon. Secs. are the Rev. W. F. Cobb, and Colonel Horsley, R.E. The Alliance now numbers 221 members. We are glad to observe that the School at Ramsgate gives good promise.

The Very Rev. the PRESIDENT, in his opening address said:—

In all the most material points the South-Eastern College is a great success. We have, by God's blessing, secured just the sort of head-master that we desired. He has gathered round him an efficient staff, and boys are coming in such numbers that we are ever in difficulties, because the increase rapidly outgrows our means. . . . . We think, however, that with reasonable liberality on the part of those who are anxious that the education of the middle classes shall not be entirely in the hands of the Ritualists, such a portion of the necessary funds may be contributed as will justify the Council in making a substantial beginning. Very much larger sums [than £15,000] have been raised for the erection of schools and colleges which we consider do not teach the reformed and Protestant principles of our Church. If we do not think our principles worth maintaining at some sacrifice, they can have but a slight hold upon our hearts. But I have no such fears; and though the erection of the school buildings must for a long time be a matter of considerable anxiety, yet there is little doubt that they will be raised and paid for. They are for God's honour and glory, and the benefit of His people; and when more is known about their purpose and efficiency, the means, I doubt not, will be provided, especially if some privileges are given to donors, such as the right of nominating a pupil, or the like. And when success has crowned our efforts, we shall trust that God will enable us to found somewhere a school which shall receive boarders, and give them a good, sound education at a still more moderate cost. Our first attempt must be upon remunerative terms; but this may, and will, we trust, be followed by one on terms which will simply prevent loss.

What the present state of the new buildings is we do not know.

We heartily recommend this *Tenth Annual Report*.[1] The Clerical and Lay movement, we trust, is gaining strength.

---

[1] By an inadvertence which we regret, the *Report of the First Annual Meeting* of the Sussex Clerical and Lay Association has not been noticed in THE CHURCHMAN. The title of this Society is—"The Church of England Clerical and Lay Association for the maintenance of Evangelical Principles." The President is the Earl of Chichester; the Vice-President, Prebendary Snowdon Smith; and the Clerical Hon. Secretary (to whose zeal, we think, the success attained is mainly due), is the able Incumbent of St. George's, Brighton, the Rev. J. H. Rogers.

*The Truth of the Christian Religion as Established by the Miracles of Christ.* By RAM CHANDRA BOSE. Pp. 420. The Religious Tract Society.

The author of these lectures, we learn from the Preface, is a convert of the Free Church of Scotland Institution in Calcutta, founded by Dr. Duff. He was baptized when he was fifteen years old. For ten years he was head-master of the central school of the London Missionary Society in Benares. For a further period of ten years he was in the employment of the Government. Since then he has been in connection with the mission of the American Methodist Episcopal Church. How well fitted he is for his work in lecturing to educated natives of the great cities of Northern India on the claims of Christ and the Gospel, is fully proved by the lectures contained in this volume.

*The Lord's Table.* Meditations on the Holy Communion Office. By the Rev. E. H. BICKERSTETH, M.A. Pp. 266. Rivingtons.

We gladly recommend this welcome book, a series of Papers, expository and practical, yet fitly termed "Meditations," together with some most appropriate and delightful hymns. It is, in a devotional sense, one of the richest books with which we are acquainted.

*Children's Flowers.* Religious Tract Society.

The short papers in this attractive volume have been written for children, not to teach them the science of Botany, but to excite their power of observation and increase their love of flowers. The work has been done remarkably well. The daisy, dandelion, harebell, clover, wild rose, hawthorn, the commonest of flowers, have been chosen; and the descriptions are excellent. We must not omit to mention that this gift-book, a capital prize for our rural parishes, has a charming cover.

*Biographical Sketch of Pastor John Bost (Founder of the Asylums at La Force, in Dordogne.)* By A. BOUVIER MONOD, Pastor. Pp. 48. Nisbet & Co. 1882.

Jean Antoine Bost was born in 1817, at Moutier-Grandval, where his father was pastor for ten years; but he was not ordained until 1844. He owed much to Adolphe Monod. His philanthropical works are well known.

In the *Homiletic Magazine* (Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.) a very cheap shilling's worth, appear several Homiletic and Expository papers. Dr. Scrivener laments the alteration in a passage so dear to the memory:—

> Glory to God in the highest,
> And on earth peace:
> Good will among men.

("Among" is truer to the original than "towards.") He remarks that in the R.V.—

> Glory to God in the highest,
> And on earth peace among men of good pleasure,

to say the least, the sense is darkened. The practically unanimous voice of the Greek Fathers, says the learned Doctor, should have decided the point as against the revised text.

The *Church Missionary Gleaner*, a wonderfully good pennyworth, contains Letters from India to my Children, by the Rev. E. H. Bickersteth, with illustrations, and Sketches of Missionary work in Palestine, by Louisa H. H. Tristram. Of Es Salt (Ramoth Gilead) as a Christian

station, Miss Tristram gives a delightful sketch, one of the best things of the sort we have ever seen. A few lines we must quote :—

It was in such drenching rain as only travellers who must be regardless of weather know the discomfort of, that we left Ammân for Salt. We were more fortunate during the latter half of our ride, when it cleared up, and we were able to enjoy the beauties of the Land of Gilead, certainly the most picturesque part of the Holy Land. We passed through lovely glades of oak-trees; then over open moorland; and lastly a most precipitous and rocky defile brought us face to face with the town of Es Salt, built on the steep slope of the hill. Here we were greeted warmly by a little knot of the men belonging to our small Protestant community, and by them led to the Mission-house, where we were most hospitably received by the Rev. Chalil Jamal, our C.M.S. Native pastor.

In the *Church Sunday School Magazine*, Canon Saumarez Smith writes on The R.V. as a Commentary. In the *Church-Worker* appears an excellent lesson-study on The Unjust Judge, by Mr. Eugene Stock.

The third edition of Mr. BROCK'S well-written and interesting little book, *The Cross: Heathen and Christian*, illustrated (Elliot Stock), contains quotations from the best works on this subject.

A new edition of *Better Days for Working People*, by Dr. W. G. BLAIKIE (Religious Tract Society), has been issued, revised and enlarged. We should be thankful to know that so sound and practical a book was worthily circulated among the working classes.

From the Religious Tract Society we have received a packet of *Embossed Texts, Prayers and Promises*—excellent for Sunday Schools; also a threepenny edition, well illustrated, of MRS. WALTON'S *A Peep behind the Scenes*. Other pretty gifts for Sunday School children we have received from Messrs. S. Hildesheimer & Co. (card packet No. 643), *Pictures from Palestine*.

Messrs. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co., are issuing, in monthly parts, a new edition of the well-known *Bible Educator*, edited by Dean PLUMPTRE.

The *Leisure Hour* contains an autobiography, hitherto unpublished, of William Jackson, of Exeter (born in 1730), whose "Te Deum in F" has long been known so well.

In *The Antiquary* appears a very readable paper, by Mr. J. H. Parker, on the Colosseum at Rome (Colosseum is better than Mr. Burn's *Coliseum*). There are three illustrations.

We have received the first monthly part of *Cassell's Illustrated Bible*. Each part is to contain a coloured plate; an original painting by an eminent modern artist, reproduced in colours by chromo-lithography. This work will also contain about 1,000 original engravings. This illustrated edition of the Bible is known probably to many of our readers; is an admirable household-volume; and the coloured pictures form an additional attraction. With the picture in Part I. we are much pleased.

---

In the April CHURCHMAN, a revised edition of Dr. LITTLEDALE'S "Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome" (S. P. C. K.) was noticed, a few extracts being given from the portion recently added; and in particular we quoted Dr. Littledale's statement that the Roman Catholic work "Cathedra Petri," was "an exceptionally untrustworthy source." Mr. Allnatt, the author of "Cathedra Petri," having read the CHURCHMAN notice, writes to us complaining of Dr. Littledale's attack on his work, and requesting us to allow the plain truth to be made known. Mr. Allnatt (silent in regard to Mr. Ryder's work) points out that in "Cathedra

Petri," (1) the words of St. Augustine—"on the faith of the confession" were given (even in capitals); (2) it was stated that the Epistle of the Council of Constantinople was addressed to "Pope Damasus and the Bishops assembled at Rome;" (3) the words "by the letter of the most religious emperor" were given. As our only desire in the controversy with Rome is that the truth should be made fully known, we readily insert Mr. Allnatt's reply. He has kindly sent us a copy of his work; and on the three points referred to, we have consulted it. But with regard to his third point, our readers may compare Dr. Littledale's remarks (CHURCHMAN, page 67), with Mr. Allnatt's own statement. We quote every word of that statement as it is printed in "Cathedra Petri;" and it runs thus:—

**Council of Constantinople**, A.D. 381. In their Synodical Epistle to Pope Damasus and the Bishops assembled at Rome, the Eastern Fathers say:—"You have summoned us as YOUR OWN MEMBERS (ὡς οικεια μελη) by the letters of the most religious Emperor" (*Ap. Theodoret. Hist. Eccles.* lib. v. c. 9); and **the Pope** in his reply says: "Most honoured CHILDREN (ὑιοι τιμιωτατοι), in that your charity accords to the Apostolic See the reverence due, you confer the greatest honour on yourselves" (οτι τῃ αποστολικῃ καθεδρᾳ. την οφειλομενμν αιδω ἡ αγαπη ὑμων απονεμει, κ. τ. λ. *Theod. Hist. Eccles.* v. c. 10).

---

## THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS.

*To the Editor of* THE CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—The pamphlet reviewed in the April number of THE CHURCHMAN was meant for a practical contribution to the solution of a great and pressing difficulty. With the same object in view, its two leading suggestions were submitted to the Convocation of York with a considerable amount of success. The first was carried in the Lower House by a majority of three to one, and the other was withdrawn (for want of time) with the view of submitting it to the consideration of the Royal Commission, where I have since been examined in further explanation. The issue of this Commission is the best proof of the importance of the question, and the Bishop of Winchester, who is a member of it, has publicly expressed his desire that "persons capable of doing so should suggest improvements or modifications in the form of these courts."[1] Having no party object in view, I have been glad to explain my views in the columns of the *John Bull*, *Guardian*, *Record*, and even the *Nonconformist*, and I should have no difficulty in disposing of your reviewer's objections if you could afford me the requisite space in THE CHURCHMAN.

While I thankfully acknowledge his courtesy to myself, I cannot share his "wonder at the width of the gulf" between us, when he asserts that "the office of a bishop implies something quite distinct from the ecclesiastical courts," and again, that "the power and jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts are one and undivided, and are derived from the State to which the Church, as part of the compact of Establishment, has confided complete control over its discipline." This is precisely the allegation on which the Ritualists justify their resistance to the courts, and the more extreme section concur with Dissenters in desiring Disestablishment. If it were true, the Royal Commission would have

---

[1] Lecture at Bournemouth, reported in the *Guardian*, April 19.

nothing to inquire into, and the reviewer's imaginary "compact of Establishment" would speedily come to a righteous end.

No authority for such undisguised Erastianism can be found in the language of the canons or statutes which the ecclesiastical courts administer, nor in the standard writers by whom they are explained. From the origin of these courts, under William the Conqueror, to the present hour, they have been held to exist for no other purpose than to promote the office of the bishop by judicial censures "for the soul's health" of the offender. The judge is the bishop's delegate, and his sentence is the purely spiritual one of suspension, or excommunication, from Christian privileges. The temporal punishments that may follow are the result of the State giving its assistance to the Church, not of the Church confiding its discipline to the State.

The question now under consideration by the Royal Commission is whether the provisions, incontestably established for this purpose at the Reformation, have been inadvertently departed from in later legislation, so as in any degree to countenance the objections now alleged. It is to this question that my pamphlet is addressed, and if your readers take the trouble to look at the authorities there quoted, they will perhaps come to the conclusion, that it is the reviewer who has fallen into the "portentous mass of historical mistakes," which he charges upon me. All I can do, in this letter, is to beg their attention to the two leading suggestions which are the practical outcome of the pamphlet.

The first is to make better provision for the exercise of the Bishop's office, especially in disputes of ritual and doctrine, *before recourse is had to the courts.* The principle of this suggestion is laid down by the Highest Authority, in Matt. xviii. 15–17. It has always been recognized, even in the worst days of persecution. The heretic was invariably exhorted to retract, by the bishop and others in private, before he was handed over to the secular arm. Before and after the Reformation, the greater part of the questions now brought into the ecclesiastical courts with regard to ritual and doctrine, was disposed of by the ordinaries and synods. The domestic jurisdiction of the bishop is expressly provided for in the preface to the Prayer Book, in the Church Discipline Act of 1840, and in the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874. In short, a preliminary reference to the bishop, in the hope of avoiding recourse to the courts, is a fundamental principle of all our legislation. That it has failed to answer the expectations of the legislature is one main reason for the present inquiry.

I trace the failure to two causes; 1. That being enacted by statute law the reference to the bishop becomes only another stage in the litigation. Its extent and authority are fresh questions for the decision of the court. 2. That no sufficient provision exists for securing obedience to the domestic authority. It is admitted that the incumbent, on whom the immediate responsibility rests, cannot be expected to accept the arbitrary *dictum* of every bishop: the law itself would not hold him harmless if he did, as was shown in the case of Jenkin against Cooke. My suggestion is to constitute a canonical inquiry before the bishop, assisted by experts, who might add the weight of their brotherly persuasion to his fatherly advice. The parties should appear *in person*, and tell their grievances and their objections, in the hope of coming to a settlement. I want the proceeding to be authorized by canon, in order to entitle the bishop to claim "canonical obedience" from all parties; but it should have no *legal* effect, beyond protecting those who obey the bishop's monition from the penalties of the law. If the canonical inquiry fail, the law would stand intact, and the bishop might send the case to the court if he thought fit. My conviction, concurred in by the great majority of the Lower House, at York, is that nine out of ten ritual controversies would never get to the courts.

My second proposal has respect to the Archbishop's Court, which the great Statute of Appeals (24 Henry VIII. c. 12), declares to be the final court of the National Church. Still, there was at that time, as the Act itself shows, an appeal to the Spiritual Prelates of the Upper House of Convocation. Your reviewer has been misled on this point by some modern judicial *dicta*, which I have shown to be against all established law down to the reign of Queen Anne. I have pointed out the departure from this arrangement.—1. In the tyrannical action of the Crown as Supreme Ordinary, in the Courts of Ecclesiastical Commission, by which the regular ecclesiastical courts were almost superseded, under the Tudors and Stuarts.—2. In the provision of the Bill of Rights declaring these Commissions illegal and pernicious, and so throwing a practically new jurisdiction on the Court of Delegates; and 3. In the further changes of the present reign. Without entering on these topics here, I am glad to agree with the reviewer's conclusion, that the "most probable view of the constitution of the Archbishop's Court is that the archbishop in synod formed the full provincial court, while in ordinary cases the archbishop in his official character acted as sole judge." This is exactly what I propose to revert to. Assuming the provincial court to be restored as before the Public Worship Regulation Act, and the archbishop to be represented in it by his official principal in ordinary cases, I propose to restore the "full Court" for cases described in the 24 Hen. VIII., as involving "questions of the law Divine, or of spiritual learning" in this way. The judge, on the requisition of either party, should be bound to state a case to the Upper House of Convocation, and their determination should be binding on the judgment of the Court. It would be for the judge to apply the determination to the case before him, in disposing of the suit; and from his judgment the appeal for "lack of justice" would lie to the Crown, as at present.

I am so far from attacking the Judicial Committee (as the reviewer imagines), that I do not propose to touch it in any way, as originally constituted in substitution for the Delegates. The addition of the three prelates under the Act of 1840 has already been withdrawn, in exchange for a *rota* of assessors from the whole bench, which is not generally thought an improvement. Many other proposals have been made for furnishing the Crown with spiritual assistance in these appeals, but none appear to me likely to pass the legislature. My proposal would solve the difficulty, by giving a full and free deliverance of the judgment of the Spiritualty in the Church's own court, before it came to the Crown. I am content to leave the "lack of justice" to the Judicial Committee, as a purely lay and judicial tribunal. This is a greater risk than some of my High Church friends are willing to run; but an Established Church must confide in the Crown for justice in the last resort; without this we could have no Ecclesiastical Courts at all. The weak point at present is that every judge is obliged to collect the law of doctrine and ritual from his own miscellaneous reading, more or less open to question. The great judges in the Privy Council would be thankful (as I conceive) for an authoritative deliverance of the bishops of the Province; and would give it all due weight, while maintaining the Royal Supremacy. Further than this, I for one am unable to see my way; and it is a satisfaction to find that the Bishop of Winchester, who took part in my examination at the Royal Commission, has declared his opinion that such an arrangement is both "primitive and practical."[1]

I am, Sir, your faithful Servant,

GEORGE TREVOR, D.D.

Beeford Rectory, May 10, 1882.

[1] "Bournemouth Lecture."

# THE MONTH.

THE May Meetings, as a rule, were well attended; and many most satisfactory speeches were made. The interest taken in these annual gatherings appears to be fully sustained; and the statistics presented show that, in regard both to the workers and the results, there is abundant cause for thankfulness and hope. The help of prayer is more generally realized. The Lord hath done great things for us, say an increasing number; let us thank God and take courage.

The eighty-third anniversary of the Church Missionary Society was held on the 2nd. The attendance was very large. In an admirable address, the noble Chairman, Lord Chichester, spoke of the importance of parochial Missionary Associations, and of the great missionary work, a promise of strength and blessing, which lies before the Church of England.[1] The first

[1] We cannot refrain from quoting the main portion of the venerated President's remarks. The noble Earl said:—

We have to thank God, not only for the continuance of His blessing and guidance upon His own work, but we have, I think, to thank Him for the progress, such as it is, that is clearly indicated in this Report—progress certainly in the actual work of our foreign missions, but, in my opinion, indications also of progress in the work at home. (Cheers.) Considering all the circumstances of the past year, the general prevalence of real distress in many of the industries of this country, I think it is satisfactory to know that the total of the contributions from Associations is only £300 less than it was last year, which you will remember was a very exceptional year. (Cheers.) Now, to my mind, having watched the financial part of the question as well as its more interesting spiritual side, this state of things, and also what I have heard myself of different Associations in the country, indicate that there is an increased interest in missionary work, and to a certain extent a more liberal disposition to contribute. (Cheers.) . . . . I recollect that great and good man, the late Archbishop Sumner (cheers) made a very telling speech on this platform when he was Bishop of Chester. I may just mention two things which he said. One was that as a bishop he felt under great obligations to the Church Missionary Society. (Cheers.) He said that during his visitations he always observed this, that if in any parish there was a Church Missionary Association there was quite certain to be other Christian work going on (cheers); that he was certain to find a Bible-class and a good Sunday-school, and other appliances for encouraging and promoting Christian truth and Christian life. In short, what he said was, that wherever there was a Church Missionary Association in a parish there was certain to be both light and life. (Hear, hear.) The good Bishop told them, and very earnestly, that the more the Congregations were asked to contribute to Christian objects the more they would give and the more they would have to give. Of course the good Bishop did not omit to say that all that proceeded from having first implanted in their hearts the love of Jesus. . . . . I am sanguine enough to hope that the advice so ably and feelingly given to us last night by the good

resolution was moved by Sir Bartle Frere, and seconded by Canon Tristram. The subsequent speakers were the Bishop of Victoria, Mr. Bruce, the well-known Missionary from Persia, Bishop Crowther, and the Rev. R. C. Billing. The veteran African Bishop received a hearty welcome. An interesting abstract of the Report was read by the Rev. F. E. Wigram: there is an extension of the Society's work, with a balance-sheet highly satisfactory. The total contributions are £212,910. The expenditure for the year was in accordance with the retrenchment policy of 1880; but the estimates for the current year have been framed on a much more liberal spirit. Evidently, the numbers who take a practical interest in the work of this grand Society are greater than ever.

At the anniversary of the Church Pastoral Aid, the chief speakers were Canon Hoare, the Rev. William Barker (Forest of Dean), Canon Lefroy (Liverpool), and Dr. Walters (Llansamlet). Canon Lefroy spoke of the deadly influence at work among the upper classes and the working classes; the influence represented by a terrible word—the domestication of infidelity:—

> Never I believe in the history of the English Church and literature was infidelity domesticated as it is at present. A gentleman of the West-end who has drifted into the sad practice of late banquets on Saturday nights and late dinners on Sunday, and then lounging through the Park when he ought to be at God's house, is setting a vicious example to others. He then strolls into his club and takes up a journal, perhaps the *Contemporary Review*, or the *Nineteenth Century*, or some such serials as these. In them he finds two articles, one signed by a man of God, advocating the holiest verities of the Christian faith; the other perhaps signed by the late Professor Clifford, laughing at and scorning the sanctities of religion. I need hardly say which is more likely to make an impression. He who reads this in his club is represented by the poor struggling artisan who pays his penny for the *Secularist*, the *Freethinker*, and the *National Reformer*.

---

Bishop [the Bishop of OSSORY] who preached that admirable sermon, that his what I may call very modest request will soon be fulfilled, of raising our income to £300,000 a year. (Cheers.) . . . . Now, I have only one word more to say. I hear and read, and I daresay you do the same, a great many very lugubrious complaints and statements as to the danger to which our beloved Church is at present exposed. There is the danger of going over altogether to Rome which some people believe in, or, at all events, the danger arising from the increase of superstitious ceremonies, and then there is the danger arising from the increase, as it is said, of infidelity, and from other causes which are always at work, and which hinder the work of God and His truth. But, my friends, it strikes me that, following up what Bishop Sumner said of the effect of the Church Missionary Associations in promoting the spiritual growth of the parishes where they exist, as long as the Church is faithful to her Lord's command, and to her great missionary obligations, we may be quite sure that the Lord will not forsake that Church. (Cheers.)

In his impressive closing speech, Lord Shaftesbury referred to Mr. Lefroy's "admirable expression:"—

This "domestication of infidelity" [said the noble Earl], you may now find in every house, from the highest to the lowest. You will find it in a great number of houses lying on the tables, within the reach of those who are not in the least aware that the poison is there. So insidious and so demoralizing is much of the literature of our day that, without any open blasphemy or attack on religion, it is introducing a lower system of morality and an impurity of thought that is tainting the minds and hearts of many of the young. I hope you will bear that phrase "domestication" of infidelity in mind, and be on your guard against this dreadful evil. If, when you return home, you were to examine some of the books which you have purchased, and some of the periodicals which you take in, you would, I dare say, find in some of them something which you were not before in the least aware of.

"Forty-seven times" has the noble President of the Church Pastoral Aid ackowledged a vote of thanks.

At the eighty-seventh anniversary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the speakers were the Bishop of Bath and Wells, the Rev. Robert Bruce, the Rev. W. L. Harris, the representative of the American Bible Society, and others.[1]

At the annual meeting of the London City Mission the Bishop of Liverpool made a telling speech. The Bishop said he welcomed every evangelical effort to do good; nor was he backward to say that "he welcomed any good done by General Booth and the Salvation Army. (Loud cheers.) Of course he did not say that he approved of all the ways in which the work was done. It might not be done in exactly the way he should like, but he thanked God when sinners were brought to Jesus." Canon Fleming said:—

Happily they were living in very practical days, when men were devising every possible means of reaching souls that had never yet been reached. Hence had sprung up the Blue Ribbon Army and the Salvation Army. (Cheers.) The Blue Ribbon Army had come of necessity, because temperance workers had never touched the classes which that organization was reaching, and they had perhaps been

[1] We quote one paragraph from the Report:—"The revision of a version of the Holy Scriptures is a matter with which your Committee have often to deal, and in which they always take the deepest interest. In no revision is that interest deeper than in that of the English version, of which the New Testament has been published since your last anniversary. But inasmuch as the large constituency which they represent is divided in its views upon the part already published, and the work is still incomplete, your Committee have decided that the time has not yet come for discussing with advantage at a general meeting of the Society any modification of its rule which limits its circulation in the languages of the United Kingdom to the 'Authorized Version.'"

in danger of dying of respectability in drawing-room meetings. (Laughter.) As a total abstainer of nearly twenty years' standing (cheers) he must confess his gratification to find from the Report, and from the Bishop's speech, that the subject of temperance was taking such hold, not only upon public opinion, but upon the Churches.

At the annual meeting of the Church Parochial Mission Society, the Archbishop of York, in the chair, spoke of the "immense good" which had been done by Mission Services. "Twenty years ago there was great fear in reference to the C.P.M. Society; now there was none." The Archbishop also referred to the work to be done by the Laity:—

Just now [said his Grace] there was a very curious movement going on known as the Salvation Army. He might tell them, as a sign of the times, that from a large ruridecanal meeting he had received a letter asking how far he sympathized with this movement. What was the truth about this Salvation Army? There had been a prejudice excited, their members had been rather noisy, but there might be worse things than that. In one of the churches of the diocese some of the members of the Army had asked to be allowed to partake of the Holy Communion. They had attended—not the whole body, but a large number, and no more devout or more earnest communicants had ever been seen there. (Loud cheers.) But their claim is this, that they are going down to the lower stratum of society, that they will take no repulse, and that they have now among them many persons who were looked upon a little while ago as the scum of the earth. Some might be disposed to say that this army was doing a good work, and that they of the Church ought to do a little of that kind of thing with them. He was unable at present to say more than that there should be a careful watching of their procedure, for if there were that watching he believed God would bless it, and the work of this Society would become wider in its scope. . . . . The Church of England in the future must open her arms to everything that is good. (Cheers.)

The Salvation Army movement was spoken of in Convocation. For ourselves, the movement supplies another proof that in order to reach the masses the Church must show greater powers of adaptation. Too much has been thought of a learned Ministry and ceremonious services; elasticity, freedom from conventionality, attractiveness (not ritual), are required. The services of the Laity must be more largely, freely utilized.

At the anniversary of the Irish Church Missions, the Chairman, Earl Cairns, said:—

We are here to-day at the thirty-third anniversary meeting of the Irish Church Missions, and I am sure that there has never been a meeting of this Society held under circumstances more anxious or more critical. The first thought which now arises in every one's mind on rising in the morning is connected with the present condition of Ireland. We have been horrified in this country within the last two

or three days by news of murders in Ireland more heartrending, more diabolical, than almost any that we have ever heard of. But you must remember that, although those murders may come home more distinctly and clearly to the minds and feelings of people in this country than any previous ones, yet for months past there have been committed from time to time in Ireland murders and outrages not less cruel or heartrending, and which have brought desolation, grief, and agony into many homes in that country. This is not the place to consider from a political point of view what legislative or other measures should be taken in consequence of the present state of that part of the kingdom, but it is the place to consider whether a Society like this may not be able to do that which no legislation can do, that is, to bring home to the people of Ireland what they have not got at present, or have got only in a very limited degree, the inestimable blessing of the Word of God, the pure, full, and free Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Duke of Albany, Prince Leopold, was married to the Princess Helen at Windsor Castle. The bride's parents, the Prince and Princess of Waldeck, were present, the King of the Netherlands, and other illustrious visitors.

Lord Carnarvon has drawn attention in the House of Lords to the Oxford University Statutes. Lord Salisbury admitted the truth of much that was advanced, but he thought that the rejection of these statutes would only lead to something worse. The Bishop of Lincoln, however (we gladly note), carried his motion concerning Lincoln College.

Mr. Forster's retirement from the Cabinet, and the release of Messrs. Parnell, Dillon, and O'Kelly, were announced in Parliament on the same day (the 2nd). Mr. Parnell and his two colleague "suspects" from Kilmainham, after two days, took their places in the House; and the new policy of the Government was debated. It was generally felt that the understanding or agreement between the Government and the Land League leaders was a serious mistake. The *Record* of Friday (5th) spoke of dangers to be apprehended from the Riband Lodges and the Fenian Brotherhoods, "kindred although rival organizations."[1]

[1] On the 4th, in a statesmanlike speech, Mr. Forster explained the reasons of his resignation. The right hon. gentleman said:—"I think the same reasons which obliged me to vindicate their detention, on the ground of prevention of crime, obliged me to object to their release, because I believe that tends to the encouragement of crime. (Cheers and counter cheers.) Why were these gentlemen [the three members] arrested? The real ground why these gentlemen were arrested, and why many others were arrested, was because they were trying to carry out their own will, their unwritten law, as they often called it, and to carry it out by working the ruin and the injury of the Queen's subjects, by intimidation of one kind or another. And that was carried on to such a degree that no Government could have allowed it to continue without becoming a Government merely in name and a sham. I was obliged to go over the grounds on which these gentlemen were arrested. Under what

Lord Frederick Cavendish, Mr. Forster's successor as Chief Secretary, entered Dublin, with the new Lord Lieutenant, Earl Spencer, on Saturday, the 6th. After transacting necessary business at the Castle, the Chief Secretary walked across the Park to the Viceregal Lodge, having been joined by Mr. Burke, the Under Secretary. It was about half-past seven o'clock. Suddenly, Lord Frederick and Mr. Burke were set upon by four men, and were brutally murdered.

On the 11th, a Government Bill was introduced for the prevention of crime; and on the 15th a Bill dealing with arrears of rent.[1] The debates on the *clôture* have been for the time suspended.

Mr. Stanhope's Church Patronage Bill was talked out by Mr. Richard. A proposal on the part of the Government to submit the Bill, together with Mr. Leatham's, to a Select Committee could not disarm Liberationist opposition.[2]

Ralph Waldo Emerson did not long survive Longfellow. Originally a Unitarian minister, he was known as a friend of Carlyle. Mr. J. N. Darby, the leader of a great section of the

---

circumstances could I have approved of their release? I would have released them as soon as I obtained security that the law of the land would no longer be set at naught and trampled under feet by them." (Loud Opposition cheers.)

[1] On the 15th was read a letter from Mr. Parnell which forms a portion of the "documentary evidence" to which the First Lord of the Treasury, while repudiating the notion of a "compact" [the Kilmainham "treaty"] had referred. The last paragraph of Mr. Parnell's letter runs thus:—"The accomplishment of the programme I have sketched out here would in my judgment be regarded by the country as a practical settlement of the Land question, and would, I feel sure, enable us to co-operate cordially in the future with the Liberal Party (loud and prolonged Opposition cheers) in forwarding Liberal principles (Opposition laughter and cheers), and I believe that the Government, at the end of the Session, would, from the state of the country, feel themselves thoroughly justified in dispensing with further coercive measures." (Loud ironical Opposition cheers.)

[2] We cannot agree with the *Guardian* as to the prohibition of the sale of advowsons. But the advice of the *Guardian's* article (May 10) is admirable:—"Even at this difficult time Churchmen should make up their minds definitely to secure at any rate as much as Mr. Stanhope's Bill gives, and then, with regard to what lies beyond, to be guided by the circumstances and possibilities of the case. . . . . The question is in the main ripe for legislation; the present position of affairs shows that so far a fair consensus can be obtained; and nothing is required but steady and determined pressure to carry through a fairly substantial measure. As if to stimulate our energies, we have brought before us at this moment scandals in the traffic in benefices, which are the delight of our enemies, and which should be a shame to ourselves. Once more we would urge that the removal of patent abuses is of far greater consequence to the Church than the settlement of many questions of ritual and jurisdiction which are hotly debated; and that, if the virtual agreement of opinion on this subject were but supported by an unanimity of energetic action, the thing required would soon be done."

Plymouth Brethren, has passed away. Many *In Memoriam* tributes of Mr. Darwin have been published. The *Record's* remarks as to Darwinian "facts" and "theories" are excellent.

The Bishop of London's Union of Benefices (London) Bill has been read a second time, as has also the Bishop of Exeter's Pluralities Acts (Amendment) Bill.

At the Salisbury Synod a proposal to send representatives to the Central Council was negatived. The Bishop said that he "did not want to see a Convocation of *laity!*" The *Guardian* comments on the "jealousy" displayed by a minority of the Lower House of Canterbury.

The Bishop of Rochester has delivered a Charge to the Churchwardens of his diocese. After stating his reason for visiting the churchwardens apart from the clergy, and explaining the origin, nature, and purpose of the office of churchwarden, his Lordship proceeded to deal with its main duties, which he described as threefold—viz., structural, administrative, and disciplinary.

A most severe gale passed over the southern part of England, doing much damage to trees and gardens. Nothing like its blistering effect on leaves is remembered.

In his Visitation, the Archdeacon of Warrington spoke of Contumacious Clerks. The end of all legislation on this question, he said, should be not so much to punish the parson as to protect the parish and to preserve the Protestant Reformation character of the Established Church. If penalty was unavoidable, then let it not involve imprisonment, but speedy suspension, and after renewed offences total deprivation.

That eloquent preacher, Mr. Boyd Carpenter, has been appointed to the Canonry of Windsor vacant by the death of the Rev. Hugh Pearson.

In Convocation of Canterbury the case of the Rev. S. F. Green was again considered. The Archbishop said that a Bill "had been drawn up after very careful consideration on the part of the whole Episcopate. He did not mean to say that they were perfectly unanimous on the subject. In the discussions which took place some proposals were made which went further, and some which did not go so far, but that was the result, and he did not think there was in it any chance of wandering off into a wider field of discussion." In the House of Commons on the 9th, the second reading of the Contumacious Clerks' Bill was moved by Mr. Morgan Lloyd; after some debate adjournment was agreed to. At the Conference[1] of the Church Association, on the 10th, some strong protests were made against the Bill of the Archbishops.

[1] At this Conference an excellent paper on "Evangelical Protestantism," by Canon Clayton, was read.