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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1882.

ART. I.—EXTENSION OF THE DIACONATE.

1. *Convocation of York: Report of Committee on the Diaconate.* Presented February 14, 1882.
2. *St. Albans Diocesan Conference*, 1881. Paper and Motion by Rev. J. W. IRVINE. Re-issued in a Pamphlet, entitled, "The Revival of a true Working Diaconate." London: Simpkin & Marshall.
3. *The Extension of the Diaconate.* Papers read by Rev. Canon JACKSON, at the Church Congress, Leeds, 1872; by E. L. G. HOUNDLE, Esq., at the Winchester Diocesan Conference, 1877; and by Rev. C. H. SALE, at the Ripon Diocesan Conference, 1880. Published respectively by Hamilton, Adams & Co., Paternoster Row; E. Stanford, Charing Cross; W. Weighell, Boroughbridge.

IF the important document which heads the above list should indeed find general echo in the Northern Province, and if Mr. Irvine's motion, "That it would be of advantage to the spiritual work of the Church to revive the diaconate as a permanent order, and that the office of deacon be tenable by persons pursuing an honest secular calling," should meet in other dioceses anything like the warm reception which greeted it at St. Albans, we might fairly conclude that we are on the eve of a discovery greater than any which has aroused our Church since the Reformation. The discovery, however paradoxical it may appear, is simply this; that, although the present supply of curates is utterly inadequate to cope with the rapidly increasing population, and barely sufficient to meet the almost stereotyped demand of incumbents, yet there is nothing in principle or in fact to prevent the third order of the ministry from developing an inherent power, which, with God's blessing,

may at least tide over the perilous pressure of untaught masses upon our Church. Few familiar with our towns and cities can doubt that this tide is setting in with ever-increasing strength from the country districts to the centres of labour. The multitudes without a shepherd are no longer scattered abroad, but huddled together; and while, on the one hand, they are thus the more exposed to the predatory wolves of atheism and agnosticism,[1] on the other hand, as we clearly learn from such a phenomenon as the Salvation Army, they answer all the more readily to the call of any zealous evangelist who may undertake to be their pastor. In this emergency some, jealous for the honour of their Church, would fain cry, as these Eldads and Medads of the camp arise, "Forbid them!" Others, with the nobler aspiration of the Hebrew leader, would desire a larger outpouring of the spirit of prophecy upon all the people. But neither godly jealousy nor enthusiastic aspiration should delay the appeal for increased powers to the sanctuary. And amid tumultous cries for sub-deacons, lay-deacons, lay-readers, and other nondescript "vicars of the laity," it will be, as we predict, a relief to many a zealous layman to hear the trumpet of Convocation give a certain sound, and at the same time to learn how his own services may be chartered in his Church's need, and stamped, not merely with a bishop's license, but with the seal of the ordaining Spirit.

The Report commences with a short and lucid statement of the difficulty. The Census of 1881 shows an increase of the population in England and Wales during the last decade amounting to three millions and a quarter. Add to these the arrears previous to 1871, with the present rapid migration from the rural districts into the large towns, by which the disproportion of our ministerial staff to the population of the latter is continually increasing, and the critical question of supply is at once apparent. The growth of population alone reaches a thousand a day; to overtake which, after all societies, such as Pastoral Aid and Additional Curates, have done their utmost, we should require, allotting 4,000 to each clergyman, an increase of about eighty clergy every year above the number ordained during the previous year.

The Report then proceeds by a gradual method of exclusion to discuss the problem—

1. Can the parochial system be stretched by creating new incumbencies? No. For estimating the cost of endowment—church, vicarage, school—we should need more than £16,000,000 to meet the increase of population in the last ten years.

2. Can we rise to this fresh demand upon us by reinforcing

[1] For an alarming view of this infidelity and ignorance of the masses, see Lay Memorial presented by Earl Nelson.

the staff of stipendiary curates? No. For these are already more than the overstrained system can support; and even if it could be shown (as an adverse pen has attempted) that the number of clergy ordained is now becoming nearly equal to the demand, these, be it remembered, are all required for the regular duty of manning the walls; the outside masses are still untouched; moreover, the young and inexperienced recruit is hardly the man for the trenches.

3. Can we enrol laymen to remedy the deficiency? Again, No. For that deficiency is ministerial, and they would be laymen still. However desirable such help be in itself, and how eager soever the Church to claim it as a part of the universal priesthood of all Christian people, yet no episcopal license or *quasi*-ordination could make it in the eyes of the people, or indeed in the true ecclesiastical sense, ministerial. Incompetent for all such requirements as, for example, baptizing, burying, marrying, reading prayers, or preaching in Church, the lay-deacon would be neither more nor less than a layman with a sounding title.

Driven thus, step by step, to the conclusion that no hope of remedy appears either from multiplying incumbencies, or from reinforcing the curate staff, or from employing lay help *as such*, the committee of anxious explorers suddenly strike upon a new vein. New, yet how ancient! For that rich stratum has run within the Church ever since the day when the first murmuring of neglected multitudes came up into the ears of the Apostolic Twelve; and if in these latter times there has been found a fault in its continuity, or rather if it has run too long in confusion with another yet richer seam, most surely are they entitled to cry "Eurekamen!" who have been fortunate enough to distinguish anew, and from the deep gold-mines of truth—

> to lift the hidden ore,
> That glimpses moving up.

Among such happy discoverers we think we may number those bishops and clergy of the Northern Province who have been engaged on this Report, as well as very many other deep thinkers and earnest workers, now bestirring themselves in the same direction. But it must not be forgotten—nor does the Report forget—that pioneers of still greater note have gone before them. Hale and Hook are only two of the *veneranda nomina* whose papers and conclusions here illustrate the proverb, "Keep a thing, its use will come." It shall be our business further on to quote men of very different and even opposite schools of thought, who unanimously maintain that the revival of the primitive diaconate, so enlarged as to comprehend all

such laymen as were of old eligible to the order, is the only hope of raising a force of organized volunteers that shall relieve the Church in her present distress.

But we must first endeavour to show (1) What were the original functions and limits of the diaconate; and (2) That these are still contemplated in our Ordinal, though, virtually, many of them, obscured or obliterated at the present day.

1. *The Constitution of the Diaconate.*—It would seem, according to Bishop Lightfoot, that to the office, as at first constituted, teaching and preaching were only incidental. But, as the Holy Spirit brooded over this new creation, new powers were developed; and a Stephen or a Philip, chosen "to serve tables," thus became, without ceasing to be dispensers of alms, ministers also of the Word. The Apostles themselves had directed that the persons chosen should be not only "men of honest report," but also "full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom." Hence the glorious and highly spiritual result. But still the deacon, as described by St. Paul thirty years later, is to be sharply distinguished from the presbyter. His qualifications are such as would be most important in persons moving about from house to house, and entrusted with the distribution of alms. His graces are those of ordinary laymen, "holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience." He has no "cure of souls," though he does much to minister to their higher as well as to their temporal interests. And as we trace him into the first three centuries, we find that although, to distinguish him (at least in the Latin Church) from the inferior orders, he was ordained with imposition of hands, yet were those the hands of the bishop alone, because his office was "only a ministerium, not the priesthood."[1] Bingham adds the significant remark that, for the first two ages, before the rise of the inferior orders, the *deacons performed all their offices;* such duties as afterwards fell to readers, sub-deacons, exorcists, catechists, doorkeepers, and the like.

Turning now to civil restrictions, we note that, although the Apostolical canons forbid the holding of public offices by the clergy, it was avowedly as diverting them from their special calling, or when pursued for covetousness' sake. On the other hand, there are Canons of Councils, notably the fourth of Carthage, not only permitting but requiring the clergy to earn their own living—

Arte petat victum, cui non res est, et amictum.

And Mr. Irvine gathers from Bingham and his authorities, that the "mind of the Church was only set against her ministers

[1] Fourth Council of Carthage, c. 4.

being secularized and given to filthy lucre; but that with her full approval, in primitive times, even her bishops and presbyters, and *much more* her deacons, were allowed to pursue non-servile callings, subordinately to their highest duties, for the sake (1) of example to their flocks; (2) of ability to give alms; and (3) of maintenance."[1]

From all this it is evident that the primitive deacon was in his ministerial functions clearly differentiated from the presbyter, while in social status he was half a layman, and performed much lay service which afterwards fell to the inferior and unordained orders. As regards the question of clerical habit, it does not appear for several ages that the clergy wore any distinctive dress. Yet it is not unworthy of remark that the earliest dispute on this subject turned on the question of *priestly* garb, and implies that the same black dress was worn by both priest and bishop—but is silent altogether about the deacon's attire.[2] Probably he was in the days of Chrysostom, as in those of Laud, undistinguishable in apparel from the layman.

The Diaconate as contemplated in our own Ordinal.—The exact agreement of the primitive decanal functions with those adopted in *theory* by our Church may be best seen by comparing Bingham's portraiture with our English Ordinal.

Bingham.	The Ordinal.
The Primitive deacon bids prayers in the Church; receives the oblations at the altar; distributes but not consecrates the eucharist; reads the Holy Scriptures and the homilies of the Holy Fathers; catechizes; baptizes with the bishop's leave; directs and dismisses the congregation; preaches, but only in the absence of the presbyter. Out of Church, inquires after the poor and acts as almoner to them. Sometimes keeps the door and performs other inferior duties which afterwards devolved upon the minor orders.	The English deacon assists the priest in divine service, and specially when he ministereth the Holy Communion; helps him in the distribution thereof; reads Holy Scripture and homilies in the Church; instructs the youth in the catechism; in the absence of the priest baptizes infants; preaches, if he be admitted thereto by the bishop.
N.B.—Deacons not to be or-	Furthermore, it is his office to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the parish, to intimate their estates, names, and places where they dwell to the curate (who has the cure of souls), that by his exhortation they may

[1] We might instance from modern times, under (2) and (3), the case of Robert Walker, priest in Cumberland, who supplemented his £40 a year by rope-making; and under (1) that of Dr. Strachan, now Bishop of Rangoon, who, when a missionary priest in India, returned on furlough to Edinburgh to qualify himself as an M.D.—for the Gospel's sake, that he "might gain the more."

[2] See Socrates, lib. vi. c. 22.

dained before the age of twenty-five years. Bishops and priests not under thirty.	be relieved by the alms of the parishioners and others. N.B.—Deacons not to be ordained under twenty-three; priests not under twenty-four; bishops not under thirty.

If we consider the long interval between the primitive and our English Church, nothing can well be conceived more exact than this correspondence. And Archdeacon Hale would have us further note the promises required of the deacon, how carefully they, too, are framed on the ancient model:—

The promises made by the deacon are:—official, that he will fulfil the ecclesiastical and temporal duties of the office; and personal, that he will frame his life, and that of his family, according to the doctrine of Christ, and make them exemplary to the flock of Christ; and lastly, that he will be obedient to the ordinary, and other chief ministers of the Church. Such, and such only, are the duties and obligations of the deacon's office, entrusted to him by the bishop alone, without the concurrence or sanction of any persons whatever. From the bishop alone he derives his authority, and from him alone receives it by imposition of hands.

There is not one word said about a cure of souls. His office is spoken of as "this inferior office." Nor is there any exhortation given to him, as to the priest, "to give himself wholly to his office, to apply himself wholly to this one thing, and to draw all his cares and studies this way."

Our Diaconate in Practice.—However accordant with orthodox antiquity be the theory of our diaconate, it may abundantly be shown that in practice we have long got off the right road of the primitive Church. "You are entering on an office extinct in all but in name;" so wrote Dr. Arnold to a pupil about to be ordained a deacon. And again, in a letter to the late Dean Stanley, the same writer says: "It seems to me that a great point might be gained by urging the restoration of the order of deacons, which has long been, *quoad* the reality, dead." More dispassionately, Archdeacon Hale writes: "We have not, practically, a distinct order of deacons; there will be found scarcely a single instance in which a deacon confines himself to the specific duties of the office: if the Church in her Ordinal has prescribed a sphere of duty, the boundaries of that sphere are openly transgressed." This is strong language. Let us test it by tracing the start of the English deacon.

Full two years earlier than in the ancient East—where yet men ripened more quickly—he applies for deacon's orders. He passes a difficult examination—designedly difficult, for it is viewed as the outer door (which can be barred more easily than the inner swing-door) of the priesthood. In the light of a

degree—a step, which must necessarily lead to something higher—he looks upon his novitiate. In keeping with his examination is the sacred service which usually follows—two blended into one. Perhaps he reads the Gospel—the Gospel for Priests, since priests are ordained with him. Everything—even the new habit on his back—tends to assure him that he is in some sort one of them. Certainly he must believe himself a probationary or apprentice priest: for is there not a quasi-compact between him and the bishop—very damaging, as we judge, to the deacon as such—that his novitiate shall expire at twelve months' end?

Overawed with a sense of his responsibilities, greater far than is justified either by the promises made or the charge received, he goes forth, it may be, to a sole cure or a district church, the realities of which, while they utterly outstrip the terms of his commission, will overwhelmingly confirm his awful misapprehensions. But on his way—our readers will pardon the anachronism—he meets, let us suppose, a brother deacon. No clerical garb has this other: he wears a silken court dress. A sword dangles at his heels. It is Deacon George Herbert. How strangely would these two look, the one upon the other![1]

The example of George Herbert—whose long diaconate would have been, like his friend Ferrar's, lifelong, but for the urgent entreaties of Bishop Laud—goes far, in our opinion, to disprove Mr. Irvine's suggestion, that we have *inherited* this serious decline in practice from the Pre-Reformation Church. But there may have been contagion, if not hereditary taint. And the words he quotes from Van Espen, certainly indicate that the mischief was already begun therein, and indicate no less acutely its probable origin. Van Espen says:—

> As far as concerns deacons, the modern discipline has so declined that scarcely any office is left to the deacons except the ministry of the Altar; and even in this the ministry of the deacons is often (especially in cathedral and collegiate churches) supplied by presbyters; so that at last it has come to this, that deacons are not ordained to discharge the duties of deacons, but to ascend by the diaconate as a step to the Presbyterate. Whence, also, no one is ordained deacon that he may continue in that office, but in order that he may be promoted to the Presbyterate, when the canonical interval of time has elapsed. Whether this be entirely conformable to the will and intention of the Church let the bishops consider.

We are much mistaken if that notion of a "step to the pres-

---

[1] George Herbert, while he was a deacon, wore the dress of a layman, and kept his place of orator in the University. It was not until Laud had persuaded him to take priest's orders, and the living of Bemerton, that "he changed his sword and silk clothes into a canonical coat."—See *Life, by Izaak Walton.*

byterate"[1] be not the one screw loose, which has thrown things so completely out of gear. So inveterate had become the idea of the diaconate as being a "step," and nothing more, that Archdeacon Hale expresses the opinion, that a very few years since, "a Bishop would have refused to admit a person to be a deacon, if he desired to serve the Church no further than by the fulfilment of the duties of that office; and that the very expression of such a wish on the part of the deacon would have been considered to indicate a mind so unprepared to devote itself to God, and so engrossed in the pleasure of the world, as wholly to disqualify him for admission even to the lowest step in the Christian ministry." Surely, the Archdeacon argues, this is a grave injustice. While no man condemns the presbyter, who declines the office of a bishop, because he is unwilling or unable to undertake that burden of duty, why should he, who being ordained a deacon desires to remain a deacon, and not to undertake the higher duties of the priesthood, be visited with censure or suspicion?

But it is more than a grave injustice; it is a grave mistake; yet at least as ancient, so we suspect, as the Vulgate version of 1 Tim. iii. 13:—"*Qui enim benè ministraverint, gradum bonum sibi acquirent et multam fiduciam in fide*," &c., where the Latin arbitrarily turns the tense of the Greek word into the future, whereas the text simply runs: "are compassing to themselves a good standing." Surely as much as this might have been said of Philip, the Deacon and Evangelist, so long resident at Cæsarea, without the slightest hint of his aspiring to the priesthood. And whether the "good standing" mean in the eyes of God (as Theodoret interprets), or in the estimation of the Church (as S. Chrysostom), certain it is neither adjective nor noun involves of necessity any comparison between one order and another, nor is the presbyterate so much as glanced at in the entire context. Therefore, all the best modern criticism prefers to translate "standing" rather than "step" or "degree," in disregard of the traditional error.

Interesting as it might be to trace that erroneous drift[2] from

---

[1] Let it be once understood, that it is no more of necessary course that a deacon should go forward to the priesthood than that the scholar of his college should go on to a fellowship, and with the theory of the mere step will vanish many an earnest layman's reluctance to commit himself too far.

[2] Besides the Vulgate gloss, there are also liturgical echoes of the Apostolic text, which, in the interest of a permissibly permanent diaconate we cannot overlook—more especially as there exists a rooted doubt in some scholarly and theological minds, whether it be not part of the inspired discipline of the Church, that a deacon by discharging his office well establishes a *claim* to the priesthood. According to a form found

its probable beginning, we must here pause and devote the remainder of this article to the more practical inquiries: Would such a revived diaconate as we advocate meet the modern requirements of the Church in England? would it enlist the class of men acceptable to society? or is the project hampered with so many difficulties—canonical, statutory, and social—that however practical and restorative it be in its essence, it must succumb before the cries of "visionary" and "revolutionary."

That none of these difficulties appeared insuperable to Dr. Arnold forty years ago is sufficiently evident from the following passage, which we shall venture to analyse by the help of later utterances, to see if any subtler chemicals disturb his conclusions:—

The first step towards the restoration of the Church seems to be the revival of the order of deacons, which might be effected without any other change in our present system than the repeal of all laws, canons, or customs which prohibit a deacon from following a secular

---

in the Apostolical Constitutions of the fourth century, the bishop prays over the head of the newly ordained deacon that, "having ministered blamelessly, and without reproach," God will "make him deserving of being accounted worthy of a higher standing through the mediation of the Only-begotten Son." This apparent echo of Pauline language is again reflected—and, let it be well noted, reflected in a solely spiritual sense—by the Greek Ordinal, still in use; where the bishop prays over the deacon, that God will bestow on him the grace which He bestowed on His first martyr Stephen, and grant "that he may discharge the office according to Thy good pleasure. For they who serve the office of a deacon well compass to themselves a good standing. Do Thou therefore perfect Thy servant. For Thine is the kingdom, &c." A prayer, like the rest of the service, entirely free from any petition for promotion as such, and pointing (we think) even in its quotation of the Pauline text, to the next world.

In striking contrast, however, with this oriental loyalty to the spiritual interpretation of 1 Tim. iii. 13 is the Western decline. Indeed, most significant is the fact, that, whereas Latin commentators and Latin ordinals have mostly adopted the mundane notion of this good "degree," Greek authorities, liturgical as well as critical, have as a rule escaped the snare. If the Vulgate be supposed the *fons et origo mali*, this peculiarity is accounted for. Nor need we wonder if the stream has run muddier as it flowed further; so that in our own Anglican Ordinal the prayer is more mundane even than the Roman, which simply petitions that the deacon "by worthy ascents from the inferior office, may deserve through Thy grace to receive better things"—*i.e.*, we presume, hereafter.

With all these signs of deterioration, we must rest content with our prayer as it stands; nor, in the event of a permanent diaconate being again permissible, do we apprehend any appreciable liturgical difficulty. For, strictly speaking, it is almost as visionary for the ordinary, as it would be for these extraordinary, deacons to pray for "the higher ministries" of the Church. That ambitious plural has long had about it something incongruous, and is a curious crescendo upon the simple Apostolic cadence.

calling, which confer upon him any civil exemptions, or subject him to any civil disqualifications.

The Ordination Service, with the subscription to the Articles, would remain perfectly unaltered; and, as no deacon can hold any benefice, it is manifest that the proposed measure would in no way interfere with the rights and duties of the order of presbyters or priests, which would remain precisely what they are at present. But the benefit in large towns would be enormous, if we could have a large body of deacons, the ordained ministers of the Church, visiting the sick, managing charitable subscriptions, and sharing with the presbyter in those strictly clerical duties, which now, in too many cases, are too much for the health and powers of the strongest. Yet a still greater advantage would be found in the link thus formed between the clergy and the laity by the revival of an order appertaining in a manner to both. Nor would it be a little thing, that many who now become teachers in some dissenting congregations, not because they differ from our Articles, or dislike our liturgy, but because they cannot afford to go to the universities, and have no prospect of being maintained by the Church if they give up their secular callings, would in all human probability be glad to join our Church as deacons, and would thus be subject to her authorities, and would be engaged in her service, instead of being aliens to her, if not enemies.

All this is most telling in favour of the project. But there is one ominous sentence—"Repeal of all laws, canons, or customs" prohibiting a deacon from secular occupation. These different points, however easily disposed of *à priori* by the great schoolmaster's pen, will, some of them at least, occupy the fore-front of controversy, now that the subject is coming "within the range of practical politics."

(a.) *Canons.*—The thirty-fourth of these imposes a certain Latin test upon all candidates for holy orders. They are, "at the least, to be able to yield an account of their faith in Latin according to the Thirty-nine Articles." This somewhat oracular requirement may mean, either conversing in Latin, as was once the habit at the universities, or simply reading the Articles in that tongue. In either case it is out of date now; whatever modicum of Latin each bishop may think fit to require in these days, when Latin helps towards the understanding of Holy Scripture are less needed, he will hardly refurbish this particular rusty weapon for the special discouragement of our new deacon. It may rest among other ecclesiastical relics.[1]

Canons 75 and 76 restrict the clergy from engaging in secular employment for gain.

[1] As to the crucial test of accurate scholarship and theological attainment, it should be placed at the entrance of the priesthood, to secure men learned in the Word of God, perfect and well expert in administration; not at the door of the diaconate, to discourage men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom.

By Canon 75 they shall not give themselves to any *base or servile labour*, or to drinking or riot . . . . &c., under pain of ecclesiastical censures.

By Canon 76, no man being admitted a deacon or minister (*i.e.*, priest) shall from thenceforth voluntarily relinquish the same, nor afterwards use himself in the course of his life as a layman, upon pains of excommunication.

"The base and servile labour," read with the context, explains itself. Like similar enactments of the early Church, it restrains only from base traffic for filthy lucre's sake.

The other canon is directed against ministers who "forsake their calling"—an altogether different view of the question from that contemplated by the present movement.

The plain fact is, these canonical restrictions were intended for a less educated age, and for conditions of society, which will now be exceptional, not to say impossible. So far as the third order is concerned, they may be left where and what they are. Nothing like repeal appears to us to be necessary.

(b.) *Laws.*—It is assumed by many that the Statute 1 & 2 Vict., c. 106, ss. 27, 28, 29, must be repealed by Parliament, as forming an insuperable barrier to the proposed scheme. We venture to doubt this necessity. For the Act forbids "spiritual persons holding any preferment, benefice, curacy, lectureship, or ecclesiastical office, to engage in or carry on any trade or dealing for gain or profit, or to deal in any goods, wares or merchandize." Is it quite certain, we may ask, that this applies to non-beneficed clergy? And even if it does, there are specified exceptions—*e.g.*, farming lands not exceeding eighty acres, acting as schoolmaster, being a manager, director, partner or shareholder in any benefit, or fire or life insurance company. Furthermore, there would still be physicians, barristers, architects, bankers, military and naval officers, professional men, and men of independent fortune, persons in the civil service, country gentlemen or semi-retired merchants, all of whom, so far as the Statute is concerned, would be strictly eligible for the diaconate. Moreover, it is doubtful whether persons who are supported by fixed stipends are traders in the view and application of the Statute.

A great influx of volunteers might thus, so it would seem, be added to the diaconal staff without repealing a letter of the Statute. Some relaxation, at the same time, might be sought, and (it is thought) easily obtained from Parliament, in order to enlarge the area of choice.

(c.) *Custom.*—It is here, if we mistake not, that the tug of war will be encountered. The scheme will be denounced in some quarters as revolutionary, dividing the clergy and bringing the diaconate into contempt with the laity. Already we may hear the pattering of the first thunder-drops. "There would be

two ranks," said a recent speaker, "created within the clergy themselves—(1) the aristocracy of the clergy; (2) those who would be looked upon as the very *canaille* of the profession." To an objection savouring rather of a synagogue of Libertini we might be content to reply with S. Ignatius: "The Deacons, who are ministers of Christ's mysteries, ought to be pleasing to all, for they are not ministers of food and drink, but of the Church of God." The deacon proto-martyr was no Hebrew of the Hebrews: he was an Hellenist, despised as belonging to the Dispersion; none the less, lit up with love of souls and the grace of his commission, men saw his face as it had been the face of an angel.

"Again," objected the same speaker, "it would tend to lower the clergy in their social status—one of the greatest dangers to the English Church." Granted the need of a caveat here. But the measure proposed is less open to this danger than even the existing system. For let us consider the stamp of men chiefly contemplated. "Not novices," as Dr. Hook said in 1851,[1] "not novices in any sense, but men proved in the trial of life, and so brought to think soberly of themselves, and to know their own mind: men of above thirty years of age, married, and in independent circumstances" (needing no stipend), their characters already known, their Christian love already manifested, whether in the chamber of commerce or the chamber of sickness: candidates for no other "standing" than that of God's approval: men, in short, as in old time, of honest report which none can despise, and full of a spirit and wisdom which none can resist. We have ourselves met with a physician mighty in the Scriptures, Hebrew and Greek, and greatly blessed in spiritual as well as professional work, who at any time during a practice of forty years would gladly have further consecrated it by deacon's orders could he have found a bishop on the bench willing or enterprising enough to ordain him. Can we doubt, when we consider the thousands of Church laymen at work for Christ among the masses, that such cases at least of mature spiritual capacity, if not also of theological power, abound among the professions? "Archdeacon Hale," we are told, "left behind him more than 100 letters, many of them from persons apparently the very cream of the men whom we long to draw into the Church's ministry." It is idle to speak of such men as lowering the diaconate. On the contrary, they will tend to raise it. For the very first effect of thus "tapping a new stratum of churchmen" will be to secure an influx of choice and zealous workers,

[1] In a remarkable and far-seeing document issued by a Committee of the Clergy of the Rural Deanery of Leeds, which, under a pressure of population since then so intensified, advocated this revival; "Scarcely daring to express the degree in which they believed that, with the blessing of the Holy Spirit, it would promote the interests of pure and undefiled religion throughout the land."

who, in the maturity of their own Christian life, have hitherto been held superannuated, as candidates for the diaconate. Instances now and then may occur, after the most careful sifting, of fanatical, or eccentric, or unrefined, and pushing candidates; but even such characters, so far from seriously hindering the Church's work, as they may now do as "free lances," will often become invaluable when under control as regular Church officers. Their definite relations to bishop and incumbent will commit them to a definite course, alike steadying to themselves and beneficial to the people. Their sacred position once secured in the rank, they will readily "fall in;" and if seeming incongruities do arise, rather from novelty than from any inherent incompatibility between their title and honourable secular employments, these will be absorbed and gradually disappear in the order of march.

In spite, then, of all innuendoes to the effect that they will divide the clergy and offend the laity, we venture to assure the worshippers of custom that our new deacons will justify themselves. Difficulties there will be, of course; but none that ought to turn the scale in a question of right principle like this; none but what will adjust themselves in practice without dangerous friction.

In fact, thanks to the indomitable perseverance of those who have kept this Apostolic principle steadily in view, the sky is already clearing. Signs are not wanting that the visions of such men as Hook, and Hale, and Arnold, were seen in that darkness just before dawn—

> When dreams
> Begin to feel the truth and stir of day.

There is now, among darker symptoms, a stirring as of renewed life, or desire of life, in the streets and lanes of our cities; there comes a murmur of multitudes and of heterogeneous classes, like that of the Hellenists at Jerusalem, which cannot long be neglected by our successors of the Apostles. Indeed, we have reason to know that many of our spiritual rulers, and more year by year, have been awakening to the consciousness that they might do worse than revert to the Apostolic and Scriptural type of remedy in this pressing need. The question has made great progress among them since the meeting of archbishops and bishops at Lambeth, in 1866. The minority in that adverse manifesto has been ever since growing in weight and numbers, till we have reason to count on many of the foremost and most experienced on the bench. Nor is it too much to hope that the Archbishop of Canterbury, favourable as he has recently declared himself to the admission of lay help, will ere long see his way to enlisting it on the lines of Apostolic institution, primitive use,

and the principles of the English Church. All this, added to the Report in York Convocation, justifies the hope of speedy action, and action in the proper quarter. For this is pre-eminently a case of "nil sine episcopo," or rather, episcopis. Only by concerted action of the bishops can the thing be done. Otherwise, the deacons ordained in one diocese might "appear as ghosts to trouble joy," and cause confusion in the next.

Meanwhile, bishops are naturally and rightly cautious, because on them will devolve, with all its intricacies of handling, the arrangement and the care of the revived order. And we are free to confess a certain apprehension, lest, in view of this grave addition to their responsibilities, the conductors should hesitate, and this relief-train, now all but in motion, should either be recoupled to admit a new carriage, or shunted into a convenient siding. Our misgivings point to two alternatives which have been suggested; the first, after a trial of one hundred years, long ago discredited; the second, in fear of issues the most deplorable we shall do our best to disparage.

1. Some propose to supplement the diaconate by admitting to the order at the age of twenty-one. Not to dwell upon the significant fact that this is four years earlier than the age appointed by the ancient Church, the plan, as Mr. Sale points out, has been tried, found wanting, and discontinued by our own.[1] The proposal to revive it was argued out of the field in the Southern Convocation, in 1879, when, on the motion of Archdeacon Ffoulkes, it was negatived by a very considerable preponderance of authority, and by a large majority of votes. No less distasteful has it proved to the Lower House of the Canadian Provincial Synod, who, in their Session in 1880, rejected for the second time a clause submitted by the Upper House, empowering a bishop to ordain at the age of twenty-one. "All our experience in the Colonies," says the writer of the report to the *Guardian*, "shows that the relaxation would have a most injurious effect; and every member of the Lower House connected with the education of the clergy voted against it." We agree with him entirely. At home, too, such an addition would be an additional element of weakness. A better educated laity requires a more fully educated clergy; and at a time when technical education is demanded for every calling and profession, the ministry should not be the only profession open to imperfectly prepared and untrained novices. Moreover, the youths of our universities, often more versed in athletics than in theology, should not be encouraged to make, ordinarily at the immature age of twenty-one,

[1] It was the rule in the Anglican Church, from the Reformation to 1663, and is still the practice of the Churches of Scotland and of the United States.

so solemn and irrevocable a choice, involving the reception of indelible orders. The American Church may be fertile in innovations, and the Scotch distinguished by the greater gravity and stability of the national character; still, we best know our own requirements; and it was not without such valid reasons, as must be accepted as conclusive, that our Church, after experiment of a century, reverted more nearly to the primitive practice of all Christendom.

We note, therefore, with satisfaction, that the York Committee is not prepared to recommend this lowering of the age of admission; while we re-echo the hope of the Canadian reporter that we "shall hear no more of it."

2. The second alternative proposed is a sub-diaconate. There is something most attractive in this pretentious title to all who fear the shock to public opinion or to episcopal nerves, which would be caused by a revival of the Scriptural reality. But, beyond the title, we fear it has little to recommend it. The primitive sub-deacon was little more than a verger; in the Roman Church, "bearing the chalice and the dish at Mass, and attending on the assistant minister." According to a regulation of 1385 he might be ordained at seventeen! Have those who propose the revival of this minor order seriously considered that sub-deacons were never of any great real service? So far from supplying any part or province of the increased spiritual ministration which we now require, they were (to quote the able Appendix of the Report of the Exeter Conference) mere "ritualistic accessories." Add to this Bishop Temple's valuable comment, that it would be incomparably more difficult to induce Parliament to consent to the necessary legislation for creating and controlling such a body, than to procure a relaxation of the restrictions on the occupation of a deacon. "After all, although the new order might seem to be a revival of an old order that bore that name, it would not really be a revival, but an entirely new creation. And the innovation might be apparently less, but it would be really greater."

We further question—and it is a matter well deserving their most serious consideration—whether the bishops *per se* have any power whatever to create such an order; and whether such a quasi-ordination without the authority of the Church formally and synodically expressed, be not, as Canon Jackson gravely warns, a great unreality, which must sooner or later cause "confusion in the little isle."

The Church wants deacons for what has been deacons' work for almost nineteen centuries; and to give her men, dressed in a little brief authority, to trespass on those functions without the inherent power to fulfil them, would be a wrong to the laymen themselves and to the Church at large. And with the

true diaconate ready to hand, its principle and suitability admitted, its motive powers capable of almost immediate expansion, the timid substitution of this mediæval anomaly would well deserve the above-quoted caustic illustration of a train already in motion shunted into a *siding*—a situation parallel for a little way, yet leading nowhere but where the ordinary pedestrian can go equally well.

While we thus deprecate a sub-diaconate, on the ground that it would be either a dangerous and unconstitutional encroachment upon sacred functions, or an unmeaning distinction of the mere layman, we emphatically disclaim all intention of disparaging the lay element itself. On the contrary, it is from a conviction of the glorious mission now opening before our godly Church laymen—never since the Reformation more clearly fitted by latent ministerial powers, or designated by special gifts and graces—that we desire that numbers of them should wait no longer to be hired, but be lawfully called and sent into the Lord's vineyard. By all means utilize the laity as Sunday School teachers, Scripture readers, Church helpers of every kind; but let the picked men among them be enrolled in a new ministerial contingent, which will be in effect the revival of an old and all but lost ministry. The material to work upon is only too apparent; witness such memorials as Earl Nelson's, and its appalling picture of spiritual destitution: the material out of which to enlist this organized phalanx is no less obvious; witness not only the busy hive of Church workers in almost every diocese, but also the remarkable consensus of Christian judgment which cries, pointing to these earnest labourers, "Out of these restore us the diaconate." True to its name, the CHURCHMAN has always sympathized with this growing desire. We advocate the plan on principle, and we admire that principle's vitality. What Bible-student can forget that the first missionary expansion of the Church was due to the Third Order? To the Samaritan harvest, years before foreseen whitening by Him who sat on Jacob's Well, it was Philip the Deacon who put in the sickle. God may yet again honour the diaconate, if we have confidence in its inherent powers. And, indeed, the movement in this direction is unmistakable, and gathers impetus every month. Mooted years ago at Winchester by the present bishop, as he had before mooted it at Ely, the subject has taken root among the clergy of the former diocese. From conference after conference—Exeter, Rochester, Manchester, St. Albans, Ripon—the cry is echoed on; the laity in most instances enthusiastic and in large majorities, while at Ripon there was not a dissentient voice, clerical or lay. Many bishops in the United States are considering the same great question. And from Canada comes the welcome news that the Church in that dominion has embarked boldly on the

proposed scheme, thus setting a salutary example to the mother Church at home.[1]

With the report of our York Convocation before us, we cannot but hope that action will be shortly taken, and that our bishops will at last accept a responsibility too solemn and too obvious to be ignored. "*Quieta non movere*" is in the abstract an excellent maxim. But here things are not quiet; it would be a scandal to our English Church if they were. For inaction has come to mean something very like the deadlock in the first stage of the Indian famine, when thousands of natives lay dying within a few yards of thousands of rice-bags—unavailable for lack of authorized hands to distribute. The sanction came at last, and all went well.

We await anxiously—and if we, how much more our neglected masses—some analogous word of command; may it come speedily!

Meanwhile, as chroniclers of recent facts, we cannot think the triumph of a cause can be far distant, when all schools consent, and all opponents, not venturing to deal with the principle, content themselves with objecting hypothetical difficulties and alternatives, either obsolete or demonstrably insufficient.

We congratulate the Northern House on its courage in bringing out of its treasures things new and old; while we hail the omen that in this new departure of home evangelization, missionary soils so ancient should be found intermingling, as those of British St. Albans and Anglo-Saxon Deira.

JACKSON MASON.

---

[1] The Synod, which is said to have been at work in committee now since its establishment endeavouring to devise some practical means for the revival of the primitive permanent diaconate, has at length adopted the following canon:—

A deacon need not surrender his worldly calling or business, if the said calling be approved by the bishop, unless he be a candidate for the office of the priesthood, to which he shall not be admitted till he shall have passed a satisfactory examination in Latin and Greek, and have further complied with such other requirements as the bishop of each diocese may impose. Every deacon, who shall from necessity be placed in charge of a parish or mission, shall be under the direction of a supervising priest until he be advanced to the priesthood.—*Report*, Nov. 3, 1880.

June 9, 1882.—As we write, comes another Canadian Report. "On St. Mark's Day the Lord Bishop of Ontario held a general ordination in St. George's Cathedral, Kingston, Ontario. *Deacons*—Several names. *Perpetual Deacons*—Major Bate, and Mr. H. G. Parker, Professor in the Deaf and Dumb Institute, Belleville.

"This ordination is the second occasion on which Bishop Lewis has taken advantage of the above canon for increasing his staff of ordained workers in his large and important diocese."

ART. II.—"THE CHURCH BOARDS ACT."

OWING to the general block in Parliamentary business at the present time, Mr. Grey's Bill, to provide for the establishment of Church Boards in the parishes of England and Wales, is not likely to get through the House of Commons. The Bill was prepared and brought in by Mr. Albert Grey, Mr. E. Stafford Howard, Mr Stuart Wortley, Mr. Marriott, and Mr. Pulley; and it was to have been read a second time on the 27th of April. The general character of the Bill is interesting and important, for it indicates the direction Church questions, especially those relating to administration, are taking, and it involves principles which amount to something little short of a revolution in the whole system of parochial government.

The Bill is a short one, and contains only eighteen clauses. The second clause defines the word "parish" as denoting "any ecclesiastical district with legally constituted limits, over which the incumbent of the church thereof has exclusive cure of souls." By "incumbent" is meant "rector, vicar, perpetual curate, or any curate in charge, where the rector or vicar shall be non-resident." Clause 3 enacts that "no proceedings shall be taken under the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, in respect of anything done, or omitted to be done, in any parish in which a Church Board as hereinafter defined is for the time being established." Such exemption would cut both ways: for where an extreme Ritualist and a majority of his parishioners were thoroughly at one, the ægis of the Church Board might shield the vicar from his Bishop; while a parish containing a slovenly incumbent, and laity averse to any change, would be more able to resist outside pressure in the cause of decency, reformation, and order.

Those who know the mischief and discontent which a very small number of meddlesome persons can set on foot will read the fourth clause with feelings akin to dismay. The clause runs thus:—

> If any three such parishioners of any parish as would be entitled to vote at the election of churchwardens in an ancient parish shall at any time signify by notice in writing to the churchwardens their desire that the provisions of this Act shall come into operation with respect to such parish, the churchwardens shall, within *three* days after the receipt of such notice, cause the same to be affixed to the doors of the church of the parish; and, at the same time, without any consent being necessary, summon, by affixing a notice to the doors of such church, a meeting of the parishioners of the parish to be held not sooner than *fifteen*, and not later than *twenty-one* days after the date of such notice being affixed, to consider the expediency of adopting the

provisions of this Act. Such meeting shall be held in the vestry of the church, or in such other convenient place as may be specified in the said notice.

Thus, any *three* parishioners, irrespective of creed, can *compel* the churchwardens to summon a meeting within, say, three weeks from the date of their written request. This seems a dangerous privilege to put into the hands of any three parishioners endowed with the instinct of interference and a desire to stir up strife. Three men, not obliged to be Churchmen at all, are unconditionally empowered to force the wardens to call an audience together to listen to their rhetoric. It is true that the three malcontents by themselves could not pass any measures; but those accustomed to hear at meetings the irresponsible chatter of noisy busybodies will understand the damage to the Church and mischief to the peace of the parish which could be started at such a gathering. *Three* is too small a number to initiate a Church Board; especially when no guarantee is provided as to their integrity, religion, or profession of Churchmanship.

This fourth clause is contrary to the spirit of the Prayer Book, and unjust to the communicants of the parish. The language of the Prayer Book assumes that parishioners are Church-people; and the reason why no confession of faith is demanded either from churchwardens or those who appoint them, is the reason why early Acts of Parliament concerning highways in England contain no rules for travellers on bicycles: the present state of things was never contemplated as a possibility. Churchwardens are an institution dating back to a time when the idea of Church officers themselves not Church members, and elected by persons who need not even believe in a God, was inconceivable. Still the fact remains that, in these modern days, dissenting churchwardens, partly through dissenting votes, are put into office, without any very vigorous protest from the leaders of the Establishment: so that in this nineteenth century at any rate the principle has been virtually conceded, that outsiders in religion should have a voice in parish matters, and in vestry meetings, of course, many matters purely "secular" are of necessity debated and dealt with. By common consent indeed strict Church membership is not in these days an absolute essential in a lay Church officer. But it is one thing to allow an anomaly to grow up; it is quite another to make it legal or to increase it by an Act of Parliament.

Clause 5, however, has elements of uneasiness in it compared with which the question as to who originated the first meeting becomes insignificant.[1] *A bare majority* is enough to turn the

[1] If a majority of the parishioners present and voting at such meeting shall resolve that it is expedient that the provisions of this Act shall be

scale in favour of a Church Board, and to foist it upon a parish divided into two camps of nearly equal size—one for, the other against, such an organization. What a charming prospect of goodwill and unity such a clause opens out to the incumbent and his parishioners! Nor does the nature of the constituency to elect the Board furnish grounds for hope. Clause 6 says:—

> The persons entitled to vote upon the expediency of adopting the provisions of this Act, and for the election of members of the Church Board, shall be the same persons as would be entitled to vote for churchwardens in such parish, if the same were an ancient parish.

Were the Church Board merely a multiplication of people's wardens, or sidesmen, somewhat after the manner suggested by Bishop Ryle in his excellent letter, recently published, little need be said against this sixth clause, but the present proposition is to call into being a council upon which enormous power is to be conferred; a council to possess authority not only differing in degree, but in kind, from that of churchwardens. Now the rights and duties of churchwardens have been ably and clearly stated by the Bishop of Rochester, in his "Primary Charge, to the Churchwardens of his Diocese," and printed in the June number of the *Diocese of Rochester Church Chronicle.* One or two quotations will suffice:

> The main duties of a churchwarden may be described as threefold: *structural*, or those which relate to the maintenance and repair of the fabric; *administrative—i.e.*, those which refer to the apportionment of seats among the parishioners, and the keeping of church accounts, and custody of the benefice during sequestration; *disciplinary*, such as those of maintaining order in the church and churchyard, and correcting moral abuses and general negligence of religion, which, so far as the parishioners generally are concerned, is now of necessity fallen into disuse. Those also must be named which have a special reference to the visitations of the Ordinary, whether Bishop or Archdeacon, and go under the head of presentments, affecting severally the ritual, doctrine, and personal conduct of the minister of the parish, as well as the names of all who have behaved disorderly in the church, or in anywise hindered Divine Service.

The Bishop of Rochester further reminds us that the usual,

---

adopted with respect to such parish, the churchwardens shall forthwith give notice in the manner aforesaid that, at the next meeting of the parishioners for the purpose of electing parish officers, the number of persons prescribed by this Act for such parish shall be elected to constitute, with the incumbent and churchwardens, the Church Board of the parish. Each person present at such next meeting, and entitled to vote, shall be entitled to vote openly for any number of persons not exceeding three-fourths of the number of vacancies; and the persons who have the greatest number of votes shall be elected.

though not the universal, custom is, for the incumbent to nominate one churchwarden, and the parishioners the other. He also adds, "dissenters are legally eligible for the office."

The nominee of the incumbent may be assumed to be a staunch Churchman, and of course a communicant, while the people's warden is, in nine cases out of ten, at least a professing Churchman: yet the powers committed to them are utterly insignificant when contrasted with those given by this Church Boards Act to a body of men, of whom only the vicar and possibly the two wardens need be counted as communicants, and who settle all questions by a majority. Clergymen who, like the present writer, feel no jealousy of the laity, but rather encourage them to have a voice in Church affairs, ought, surely, to carefully consider these points before they give in their adherence to any such Church Boards Act as Mr. Grey's. Church Boards in the abstract we may heartily approve of; but the measure before us gives laymen generally too much power, and power over too wide a range of subjects, while it throws the odium of objecting upon the incumbent.

Clause 10 sketches the powers of this novel parish parliament as follows:—

> The Board shall have the power from time to time of making any change not contrary to law in the manner of conducting the Services and ministrations of the Church, or in the vestments worn by any person officiating or assisting in such Services, or in the arrangements for the seating of the parishioners, or in the lights, ornaments, decorations, furniture, or fittings of the church. The Board shall also superintend the distribution of all moneys collected within the church, and undertake the management of any matter of an ecclesiastical nature affecting the general interests of the parish which has heretofore been managed by the incumbent, or by the incumbent and the churchwardens. The body shall be a body corporate, and shall have power to acquire and hold property of any kind in trust, to retain or apply the same for any religious or charitable object connected with the parish.

This tenth clause contains so many important points that it is well to restate them briefly. The Board has control over:—

1. The method of conducting the service.
2. The official vestments of the vicar.
3. The seating of the parishioners.
4. The ritual and furniture of the church.
5. The distribution of church moneys.
6. Matters of general interest "heretofore managed by the incumbent, or by the incumbent and churchwardens."
7. Religious and charitable property committed to the Board as trustees in their corporate capacity.

The pulpit appears to be the only place where the vicar can

speak with any freedom or authority. This tenth clause is a sentence of abdication from the headship of the parish, passed upon the vicar. It is true that he and the churchwardens are *ex-officio* members of the Board (*see* Clause 7); and that, if chairman, he has now and then the chance of a casting vote; but his official and social position are reduced to a minimum, and he is the slave of a majority—possibly of a majority of *one* person.

Clause 11 expressly forbids any change whatever to be made in any of the points just mentioned "without the sanction of the Board, unless the existing practice which shall be so changed is unlawful."

Still the vicar has some protection, such as it is.[1] The weapon of defence in the hands of a vicar is an appeal to the Bishop. He is at the beck and call of a band of laymen, elected by the suffrages of the parishioners, and in their hands he can initiate nothing, and can only oppose anything by asking the Bishop to exercise a veto. A dissenting minister once said to a clergyman in the North of England, "I congratulate you, Sir, on being under a bench of bishops, and not under a board of deacons." But according to Clause 14 a vicar would not be under a bench of bishops, but under a board of deacons plus one individual bishop—for observe the words, "subject to no appeal therefrom." People even of the most sluggish imagination will be able to perceive how a clause like this would hamper a clergyman situated as Dean Hook was when he first began his Church reform at Leeds. But the "last straw" will be found in Clause 15.[2]

---

[1] Clause 14 provides a gleam of comfort for the lay-ridden vicar. "If the incumbent disapproves of any such change he may within *twenty-one* days appeal to the bishop of the diocese. After the expiration of *sixty* days from the date of the notice, the change shall be carried into effect, unless in the meantime the bishop shall have decided in favour of the appeal, in which case the change shall not take place. The Bishop shall enforce compliance with the provisions of this Act on the part of the incumbent by monition, subject to no appeal therefrom."

[2] If the incumbent shall wilfully fail to obey such monition during the space of three weeks after the date thereof, the bishop who issued the monition shall, by notice under his hand, to be forthwith posted on the doors of the parish church, suspend the said incumbent from the exercise of his office as incumbent, and of the duties appertaining thereto in such parish, and sequester the revenues of his benefice until the incumbent shall signify to the bishop in writing that he is willing to obey such monition; and if the said incumbent wilfully exercises his said office or any of the duties appertaining thereto notwithstanding such notice, or wilfully fails during the space of twelve months after the date of such notice to signify to the bishop in writing that he is willing to obey such monition, such bishop shall, upon being satisfied thereof, declare by a further notice, signed and posted as aforesaid, that such incumbent is,

According to this clause disregard of the monition for *three weeks* entails suspension of the incumbent, and sequestration of the living; and if persisted in for *twelve months* is followed by deprivation; but these penalties are not the result of practices contrary to law, but practices contrary to the tastes of the Church Board and the bishop. The reply, of course, is that no bishop of the present day would press points frivolous and unessential upon an unwilling incumbent; but surely in framing Acts of Parliament the utmost stretch of power in the hands of one determined to use it should be kept in view. It is by an extreme illustration that the bearing and drift of a measure are made vivid.

Under this Act a very Low Church "Church Board" having a majority of one, backed up by a very Low Church Bishop, might strip a church of lawful adornments and furniture which had been there for years; and, conversely, a High Church "Church Board," with a majority of one, backed up by a Ritualistic Bishop, might fill a church with adornments and furniture, some of doubtful legality, very distasteful to a large minority of the parishioners. The question is, be it observed, *not* whether these cases are likely to happen at present, but whether a Bill allowing them to be a possibility some day is for the permanent welfare, peace, and happiness of the Church.

Mr. Grey's Bill, no doubt, is one symptom among many of the dislike felt for the clerical popedom which obtains in certain parishes. Dictatorial incumbents do now and then deliberately, and perhaps conscientiously, set themselves against the evident sense of the parish in Church matters; but these cases are not sufficiently numerous to justify such sweeping legislation as the Bill before us contemplates. To dethrone the incumbent and enthrone a Church Board, not one member of whom need be a communicant, is indeed a startling proposition. Whether the original three who set on foot the agitation for a lay executive be religious men or not, is comparatively of little moment; also whether the electors are all of them *bonâ-fide* Churchmen or no, need trouble us little; but that those elected to serve on a council, vested with the control of church furniture and ritual together with the entire organization of the parish, should be men of real piety and sound churchmanship, is absolutely essential to the maintenance of religion in the parish and of order in the Church.

It is little short of an insult to ask the clergy to hand over the reins of government to a body in the constitution of which

---

and such incumbent shall thereupon be, deprived of his said benefice for all purposes as if he were dead from and after the date of the posting of such notice.

Christianity is not a necessary factor. Some qualification stating that the Board be composed of "regular communicants" must stand in the forefront of any Bill to be accepted by the clergy.

Nor do bishops desire to be dragged into every parochial squabble, and to act as umpires in petty disputes. The bishops are already overwhelmed with duties, and live amongst arrears of work impossible to overtake. As long as a clergyman keeps within the law he should be unmolested, whereas the enforced meeting of the Church Board twice a year at the least (*see* Clause 8) would lead to the manufacture of grievances and the perpetuation of strife. There are in the world fussy local magnates to whom Nature has denied fame, but who aim at notoriety, who would leave no stone unturned to ensure their election to the Church Board. Business men, tired with a hard day's work in the "City," are proverbially unwilling to attend evening meetings, hence the government of many a "town" parish would be at the mercy of a clique. Men of leisure, of noise, and of grievances, would attend the meetings, and, unless the vicar courted them, would thwart and browbeat him. All the clergy who recognize the enormous harvest, and the fewness of the labourers in the kingdom of Christ, delight to see the leading laity rallying round them as Churchwardens, as Sidesmen, as Lay Preachers, as Sunday School Teachers, as Choirmen, as Managers of Schools and Temperance Societies and Bands of Hope; and in many places they welcome help from a Church Council in the administration of the parish and the stewardship of its accounts. But to surrender the executive of the church and parish into the hands of a haphazard society, and to give away the privilege of a veto and the right to initiate a change, if required, will never find favour with the clergy of England.

Let the bishops agree upon something like uniformity of use—let the services in one diocese be not so very unlike those of another; enable the Diocesan easily to punish or get rid of idle and incompetent clergy; let him have frequent intercourse with the rector, vicar, or perpetual curate as to the concerns of his parish, but do not rashly call into being a lay court through which the bishop may manipulate a parish, while the vicar stands waiting cap in hand. Draw the bishop and the clergy closer together, and let not a Church Board such as this put them asunder. Let the paternal relationship of the bishop to his clergy, especially to the younger ones, be emphasized, and let him be really accessible to each and all of them; but let him also be armed with the right to compel obedience, without incurring legal expense. The Church of England does not so much require new machinery, as the old machinery put into gear.

The ideal parish, with its brotherhood of modest and loyal

laymen, seated round an earnest incumbent, all eager for peace, and animated by an intense longing for God's glory and the salvation of souls, is truly a charming picture; but those who are familiar with human nature as wont to exhibit itself in parochial politics, in the councils of religious societies, and at the tables of committees—those who are obliged to listen to the utterances of good but excitable men, full of their own religious hobbies—those constantly in contact with members of Boards, whose one talent is the talent of always misunderstanding an opponent, should be very cautious lest, in an undue zeal for a lay priesthood, they admit into the chief seats of parochial authority persons unbaptized, utterly ignorant of Church law and Church teaching, yearning for popularity, fond of interfering, perhaps disloyal to the Establishment, and not agreed as to the very fundamentals of the "Faith once delivered to the saints." We object to place our official responsibility in the hands of such a Church Board as the one indicated by this happily abortive measure, but we heartily invite the co-operation of fit and proper laymen in parochial enterprises for God.

C. H. GRUNDY.

ART. III.—THE SALVATION ARMY.

1. *The War Cry.*
2. *The Little Soldier.*
3. *Salvation Soldiery.* By THE GENERAL.
4. *Heathen England.* By G. RAILTON.
5. *Holy Living. What the Salvation Army teaches about Sanctification.*
6. *Orders and Regulations for the Salvation Army.* By WILLIAM BOOTH.

THE extraordinary success of the religious movement associated with the name of WILLIAM BOOTH is, perhaps, the most striking fact amongst the remarkable religious enterprises of the day. And this is an age which has not been wanting in signs of unusual religious activity. To say nothing of the Tractarian and Ritualistic controversies within the Church of England, which have certainly caused stir and excitement enough in their time, we have had the remarkable revival-meetings of Messrs. Moody and Sankey, the Blue Ribbon Army, a Gospel Temperance Movement, the Children's Mission, and in the East End of London, the evangelistic efforts connected with the names of Mr. F. N. Charrington and Dr. Barnardo. But

amongst all these, and many others of a like nature, the Salvation Army stands pre-eminent, as well for the extent of its operations and the magnitude of its aims, as the marvellous success which it has achieved. Such a work cannot be ignored; and no one who seeks to estimate the value of the religious forces of the day, can leave out of account the most extraordinary and striking of them all.

The history of this movement may be very briefly told. In the year 1865 Mr. William Booth went to the East End of London, and impressed by the appalling fact that the enormous bulk of the population were totally ignorant and deficient of real religion, and altogether uninfluenced by the existing religious organizations, he determined to "devote his life to *making* these millions *hear* and *know* God, and thus save them from the abyss of misery in which they were plunged, and rescue them from the damnation that was before them."[1] For some years Mr. Booth worked on with only a very modest amount of success, until "after the work had been in existence for eleven years, it was called what it really seemed to be—an army of salvation—otherwise, 'The Salvation Army.'" From that time forward the progress has been most marked; and at the present time there are 304 stations, with officers to the number of 645, who are engaged in holding services indoors and out, to the number of 5,100 a week, assisted in this work by 15,393 speakers, all of whom are ready to bear testimony to the value of the work and its effects upon their own spiritual life. Add to this, that the Army has recently acquired the National Barracks at Clapton, at a cost of over £20,000, and that this great undertaking is already paid for, that the annual income of the army is £57,000, and that Mr. Booth has already announced his hope of erecting a temple in London, to hold 50,000 persons, and his desire to have a suitable building in every square mile. *The War Cry*, the official organ of the Army, has already attained a weekly circulation of 270,000, and this is still increasing. These are evidences of force and vitality, which demand our most serious and thoughtful attention.

It would be strange indeed if an organization which has been pushed into public prominence and notoriety, should altogether have escaped criticism. Opinions about the Army are as various and as perplexing as it is possible to conceive.

The police either recognize in its corps a power in alliance with their own, to check disturbance and control disorder, or they seize upon the officers as themselves the chief offenders against the public peace; the magistrates either applaud and

[1] "All about the Salvation Army," p. 9.

encourage them on the one hand, or on the other, fine and imprison them; the clergy either denounce them as deceivers and impostors, or, on the other hand, stand upon their platforms and administer the Holy Communion to them in the parish churches. Some bear testimony that the whole neighbourhood has been changed in character since the Army came; and others report, as the present writer heard the other day from a well-known clergyman—"I have not yet heard of a single case in my parish in which the Army has done any good, but I have met with many where grievous harm has been done." The leading newspapers discuss its plans and report its services; magazines endeavour to estimate its value; the Home Secretary burns his fingers in trying to deal exceptionally with it; the House of Commons debates about it; Archbishops and Bishops advise about it; the House of Lords discusses it; the Lord Chief Justice gives his opinion about it; and the Upper House of Convocation is petitioned by the Lower to issue a commission of inquiry into it. What is a plain ordinary Churchman to think and do? Are we to oppose the Army, or throw ourselves into its work? Are we to regard it with a friendly neutrality, or attempt that most hopeless task of absorbing it into our Church system and organization?

In order that I might convey a clear impression of an Army service to my readers, I attended on Whit Monday afternoon the Council of Holiness, held at the National Barracks at Clapton.

Impeded somewhat by the traffic of the holiday, I arrived at the hall some two or three minutes after the time advertized for the opening of the service. Outside all was life, noise, bustle, and activity. Young men, dressed in the uniform of the corps, were driving a brisk trade, shouting at the top of their voice, and doing their very best to sell the various publications of the Army, as well as reserved tickets for the forthcoming services. Entering the hall, I found myself amongst an enormous congregation of some 4,000 people, the majority of whom seemed to be from the more respectable of the working classes, though there were also a good many who were evidently of a superior position. The hall is an oblong, with sloping galleries extending from the floor to the walls on either side. At one end of the central oblong floor was the platform, on which were the General, his family, and staff officers. Immediately behind him was the band, and in the gallery along that side of the hall were the numerous cadets and officers, clothed in the simple and well-known uniform of the Army. I had never before seen the General in his uniform, which at a distance made him appear very much like a superintendent of police. When I entered,

the congregation had reached the last verse of the opening hymn—with this chorus to each verse—

> Oh, I'm glad there is cleansing in the blood,
> Tell the world there is cleansing,
> All the world there is cleansing,
> There is cleansing in the Saviour's blood.

The effect of this chorus, sung to a stirring tune by the vast audience, and as only such a congregation can sing, was certainly most striking. Before the last sound has quite died away, the voice of the General is heard to shout "Sing it again," and they sang it again with, if possible, increased force and volume, drowning the brass instruments even in their fervour. "And now," said the General, "those of you who can, sing it like this,

> Oh! I FEEL there is cleansing in the blood.

with fixed bayonets, *i.e.*, with one arm outstretched. And then yet once more"—

> Oh! I'm *sure* there is cleansing in the blood.

And this last, with banners and white and red pocket-handkerchiefs waving, and men and women dancing, and amidst a scene of wildest enthusiasm and excitement throughout the hall.

After the hymn came prayer. One after another started up to pray, with an interval so short between each prayer as to suggest the idea that he who wanted to lead in prayer must be on the alert. There seemed to be many candidates for this function, and to get the first word must be as difficult as for a Member of Parliament to catch the Speaker's eye during a warm debate. Indeed the whole scene was not unlike what one has often witnessed at a political meeting. Some of the prayers could scarcely be heard at all for the chorus of ejaculations with which they were accompanied. Nothing could well be more unlike the devotion to which we are accustomed in the Church of England; and surely the effect upon many must be that which a prominent supporter, Mr. T. A. Denny, is reported in the *Times* to have expressed, that he had been the preceding evening to an ordinary quiet service, and felt that it did not satisfy him; for he wanted to give expression to his feelings in "Amens," and "Praise the Lord," but he knew that he would have been put out for a brawler if he had. After two or three had prayed, the General himself took up the petition. I was much impressed by the fact that his prayer consisted of short sentences, repeated more than once, slowly uttered, and with pauses between, so as to give full opportunity for the ejaculations of so large a multitude. After prayer, another hymn of four verses, with a chorus

twice sung to each verse, and at the end, sung again, three times, with eyes shut, by command of the General.

Then came at last the General's address on Acts iv. 23—in continuation, as it appeared, of what he had already said in the morning. It would be impossible to describe the effect of his brief discourse, or even to reproduce the words without doing injustice to them. Suffice it to say that the address, interspersed with prayers, excited sometimes the amusement, sometimes the applause, and sometimes the loud ejaculations of the congregation as they followed the General's exposition. When he told how the "Salvation Army Apostles had been ordered by the magistrates to give up going about the streets and holding processions, and to keep to their own barracks, and leave the people to go to hell quietly;" or when he described them retiring to their company, and "holding a council of war, and reporting what the Archbishops and the magistrates had said to them;" or when he came to the words in v. 24, "Thou art God," and said, "O God, Thou wilt be a match for the magistrates;" or when again, in v. 31, "And when they had prayed the place was shaken," he observed, "I dare say they made a noise. If I had been there I shouldn't have minded if they did. If we can't shake the devil's kingdom without offending peers for life, then peers for life must be content to be offended;" or when he described the place shaking under Divine power, and said, "I don't want this place shaken, for we've just built it up at great cost, and I fear it won't bear much shaking, but I want hearts shaken till the rotten things fall down and fall away," and then raising up his hand, exclaimed, "Oh God, shake away,"—all these points, following in rapid succession, produced effects upon the audience which it is utterly impossible even to attempt to describe.

After this address came the collection, which appears to be a never failing adjunct to an Army service. During this collection no singing, or anything to distract the minds of the audience from the special work of the collection.

After another hymn came testimony from Captain Payne, Mrs. Walker, and a son of the General. The first informed us that it had been revealed to him that there was a special anointing of the Holy Ghost; and he had "gone in for it." After many days of prayer, he said, at a particular moment, "the Holy Ghost seemed to fall upon me, and go right through me, until I felt my very hair stand on end." Mrs. Walker urged that "if you are willing God is able;" while young Mr. Booth warned us that we must be either better or worse for every service in which we were engaged.

Then came the General once more, with his sharp, short, stirring sentences, winding up his audience to enthusiasm.

"What we want now," said he, "is to get to business with the Lord." And again, "I want an offering for God. You have all given an offering, and many of you will be awfully ashamed of the 3*d.* or 4*d.* you gave to the Lord when the angel reminds you of it at the last day. But I want another offering now—my Master holds the plate. HE WANTS YOU." And again, "The Lord helps you not only to be saved, but to be a saviour." "All that are ready rise up and stand and wait for God." Then seeing some moving out: "Close the doors," is the quick command of the General, "a quarter of an hour more won't hurt anybody. Now, wait on God; be definite; deal with God as you would if you were dying. Be real—wait, wait on God." Perhaps the most striking scene of all was when he asked for *silent* prayer with closed eyes. Not feeling it necessary for me to obey the General so implicitly as most, I surveyed the strange scene. For a moment there was perfect silence, but then was heard the subdued hum of prayers uttered half aloud. Then the enthusiasm seemed to grow, and there was praying aloud all over the hall until the tumult and noise and excitement became almost unbearable. But when it seemed as if it could not go on longer, we heard that those on the platform had started a hymn, which was rapidly taken up over the hall, and calm succeeded to the tumult. The whole service concluded with the hymn "All Hail the Power of Jesu's Name," to the tune of Miles Lane, but with a special chorus of its own, sung again and again with waving handkerchiefs and banners. After the blessing from the General, the immense congregation dispersed, and the hall seemed to be empty in a few minutes, the service having lasted just two hours.

Of course it will be remembered that this meeting which I have attempted to describe was not an ordinary service. It was a Council of Holiness, to which admission was gained by ticket only—that is to say, it was a meeting of the members of the Army held in order to enforce the need of holiness upon them.[1] Remembering this, I was quite prepared for the respectability of the congregation, and for the entire absence of that special class of the godless and abandoned, which it is the peculiar boast of the Salvation Army that it succeeds in reclaiming. If any

[1] "By holiness," says the General, "I mean the necessity and possibility of believers being not only saved from the guilt and power of sin, but from its very indwelling; sanctified body, soul, and spirit, and preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."—*Salvation Soldiery*, p. 69.

About the teaching of the General upon this important subject I shall have something to say farther on. At present I only wish to point out the character of the meeting to which I have referred, and to distinguish it from an ordinary service.

representatives of this class were present, then assuredly they were now "clothed and in their right mind," for the white pocket-handkerchief alone, is the sure mark of a refinement beyond the reach of the ordinary working-classes. Indeed, to wear a collar and to use a pocket-handkerchief are in the eyes of the lowest classes almost synonymous with a profession of religion. I remember on one occasion a man of this class speaking disparagingly of a companion, who seemed to be in feeling and character a little above the rest, and said of him that he was in no way better than his companions, and then added with withering scorn, "though he is so religious with his white collar." That is to say, that though he had made an outward profession of religion by wearing a white collar he was not really any better than the rest. Certainly I was by no means prepared for the very satisfactory number of white collars and handkerchiefs amongst the followers of the Salvation Army. Nor did I expect to find so large a proportion of young people and even children at the service. It would be interesting to know what is the average age of those who have become officers in the Army; but I should think from what I saw that the majority of them must be quite young. At any rate, I can answer for the congregation at Clapton, which I not only watched closely but mingled with, as I walked down the road from the hall after the service was over. I am not stating this as matter of praise or blame, but simply as an evidence that all this congregation of converts did not consist of the hardened reprobates whom it is the boast of the Salvation Army to reclaim; and that at least a large proportion of them were young men and young women at the time of life when the emotional feelings are the strongest, when the affections are the warmest, and when it is most easy to attract by anything that is exciting to the feelings, and that stimulates enthusiasm and emotion.

The evident relish with which the General dwelt upon the story of the Acts of the Apostles, and applied the position of the early Church to illustrate the persecution of the Salvation Army, seemed to show that he had fallen into the very seductive and illogical conclusion, that because the Army met with no favour from those in high position, therefore it must be Divine in its origin. He was fairly entitled to argue that the persecution of the mob, or the coldness of the State officials, or the opposition of the rulers of the Church, did not of necessity condemn any religious enterprise as contrary to the will of God, but he was hardly entitled to assume that this same opposition might be pointed to as almost the credentials which proved the Divine approval of the mission which the Army had undertaken.

In trying to form an estimate of the character of this extraordinary enterprise, and of its relation to the Church of

England, it ought to be borne in mind that it is not fair to judge of the whole movement by the most extravagant and unworthy representations of it. The policy of the Army seems to be to allow every man, whether in print or at a meeting, to say or do pretty much as he may be prompted at the moment; and this policy certainly leads to some marvellous utterances. But while we must be careful not to condemn the whole Army for the rash and ill-considered utterances of a few, yet no doubt the Army must be content to bear the blame of a policy which fosters and encourages such outrageous expressions of feeling. Attention has been often directed to the fact that many of those who have been allowed to occupy prominent positions at meetings, and some who have even been admitted to the rank of officers, have been called upon to answer before the magistrates for clear breaches of common morality. Perhaps no religious enterprise can ever expect to be wholly free from this reproach, although it might be fair to expect a very high standard from members of a society which advances such lofty pretensions to personal and individual holiness.

But if the policy of the Army is to foster a premature display of personal convictions, and force into prominence as teachers those who show that they sadly need to learn, then again the Army must bear the blame of the disgrace which is brought upon religion by the insincerity and worthlessness of those whom it puts forward as professors and teachers, before it has secured any substantial evidences of their stability and sincerity. It is notorious that nothing does so much injury to the cause of true religion, as the unworthiness of those who bear the name and wear the livery of Christ; and there can be no doubt that the lapses of members of the Salvation Army have been a very prominent cause in arousing the hostility, and exciting the ridicule, of many amongst the working classes of our large towns.

Mr. Booth professes to have "carefully weighed what there is to be said against setting new converts to work thus early;[1] and is nevertheless satisfied that his plan is calculated the most effectually to prevent backsliding"—and if this be so, the responsibility must be charged upon the policy of the Army, of deliberately setting new converts to work of such sort, as that their backsliding, when it occurs, is sure to reflect seriously, not only upon the Army, but upon the profession of every form of religion alike.

Another caution may not be altogether out of place. It is natural for persons of warm and generous impulses, to subordinate their judgment to their generosity. But in estimating

[1] "Salvation Soldiery," p. 71.

the effect of a religious movement like that under our consideration, it would be in the last degree unwise to allow our judgment to be swayed by genuine admiration for the lofty motives and the devoted earnestness of the leaders of the Army. This movement must be judged not merely by the personal character of Mr. and Mrs. Booth, not by their devotion and enthusiasm, but by the plan which they adopt, by the doctrines which they teach, and by the general results which they produce. I claim the right to pay the tribute of my warmest admiration to the motives and to the character of the General and his wife. No one can doubt, no one ought to doubt, that, moved by the loftiest ambition, they have consecrated their whole lives to the service of our common Master in this cause. I go farther, and claim the right to say of them, with my whole heart, "Grace be with all them who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity." I can pray God to bless them and guide and direct them in the use of their enormous power and responsibility. And yet I dare not forego the right calmly to examine their work, and to point out what appears to be faulty, misleading, and dangerous in their system.

Now, whatever excuses may be made for expressions which are so familiar, grotesque, and irreverent, as to shock the sensitiveness of those who have been accustomed to treat holy things and sacred names with the utmost reverence and regard, it cannot be said that these expressions are used in the heat of an excited meeting, when they are reproduced in the pages of the *War Cry*. Almost any number of that journal will afford instances of expressions which it seems impossible to defend on any intelligible and reasonable ground. Take one or two examples:—

After partaking of a tremendous tea, to which 500 sat down, the soldiers were ready for the Saturday free-and-easy. They seemed to enjoy their salvation as much as they did their tea, if not more so.

The evening was the best time; we had a regular excursion to the third heavens in a Turkish bath.

Barracks soon full, and we have a real, jolly, Holy Ghost meeting. We are sweeping souls by the score up the hill to Calvary. . . . . Some twenty souls wept their way to Calvary.

We had a tremendous lot of Holy Ghost power in our midst.

The angels had their time well occupied in rejoicing over eight souls.

When I gave the invitation to those who were seeking to be holy upon earth, 700 men and women came down, and the Holy Ghost broke upon them, and fell upon us all in such a manner, it seemed to carry me nearly out of my clothes; I had hard work to stop on earth. Some jumped, and jumped, and jumped, till they jumped into the third heaven. When they got the blessing, they swam about the floor in the glory.

These choice specimens, which are all but the last gathered from a single number of the *War Cry*, are sufficient to show how dangerous is the language which the Army teaches its followers to use; and how offensive not merely to good taste and the prejudices of refinement, but also to feelings of ordinary reverence and decency. But the *War Cry*, offensive as it is, has at least some redeeming features. The very number from which most of these quotations are extracted, contains an article entitled "How they treated Jesus," apparently by Mr. Railton, in which there is much that is valuable and useful; and also some notes of an address on the "Power of Faith," by Mrs. Booth, which are extremely forcible and telling. But that a magazine of this character should obtain a circulation of 270,000, is a marvellous testimony to the extent of human folly and weakness, unless, indeed, it be, as we sometimes think, a part of the religion of the Army to press the sale of the *War Cry* even upon unwilling purchasers. I have seen working-men pressed into purchasing a number by the importunity of the female cadets, who would not be denied. It used to be rumoured, I know not with how much truth, that the most successful in these sales were rewarded by having their portraits inserted in the *War Cry*. There is certainly what is called a "*War Cry* Competition," to advance the sale. The stations at which the largest sales are made are placed in classes, and half a column of the newspaper is filled with the names of towns in which more than 500 copies have been sold, Bristol and Hull, distancing all competitors with a sale of over 10,000. But whatever may be the excuses made for the *War Cry*, it is impossible to write with calmness, or indeed with any feelings but those of horror and indignation, of the *Little Soldier*. This is a magazine which children are urged not only to read and sell, but also to write for.

Here is a notice, which appears as an advertisement:—

> You have not written for the *Little Soldier* yet. Write to-day! About your own soul, about meetings, about salvation, about other people's souls.

And again:—

> Little soldiers, get your captain to push your paper. God help you every one to push the *Little Soldier*.

As an encouragement to this, it is promised that the sale of the *Little Soldier* will be put on equal terms with the competitors' list of the *War Cry*. Now let us take a few extracts from a magazine, to the circulation of which so great importance is attached:—

> We are three happy little soldiers, and love the Army very much, because it was through the dear Army we got saved. Sammy got

saved at the penitent-form at the dear old Circus, and Emmie and Ernie got saved at home. We have the *Little Soldier* every week, and father and mother go to the Army. We each send ten stamps for the Clapton Barracks, and will ask all we can to do the same. We will try to send you some more soon, and hope Jesus will save many little soldiers at the new barracks.

EMMIE, aged eight years.
SAMMY, aged six and a half.
ERNIE, nearly four.

Again :—

I thank God I am saved. It is more than six months since I got saved. My mother and father are not saved; my brother and I are saved, and mean to press forward to the end for Christ's sake. Amen.

ELIZABETH, aged nine years.

The phrase, "I thank God I am saved, and on my happy way to heaven," which recurs *ad nauseam* again and again in every number, goes far to betray a common origin for the letters; that is to say, that the child readers of the *Little Soldier* have quickly caught from its pages and repeat in their own letters the cant phrases with which it is so plentifully adorned. It is difficult to conceive any better plan for the promotion of hypocrisy and cant than this magazine affords. That children of such tender years should be encouraged to lay aside their natural modesty and reticence, to sit in judgment upon their elders' spiritual condition, and to give utterance to sentiments like these, is too horrible to think of with complacency. And this magazine is produced under the care of an organization which does not hesitate to denounce Sunday schools, and to say, in its official organ, "The Sunday school, as well as all the other agencies of the Church, have been mainly in the hands of *traitors*, whose hearts have been far from God, even when they most honoured Him with their lips." If this be the opinion of the General, we are not surprised to find him say—"Our orders against the holding of Sunday Schools or Bible Classes in years past are still to remain in full force, and are still to be carried out in spirit and in letter."[1] The one gleam of comfort which came to me from the perusal of these self-conceited and priggish productions was from the letter of "Unhappy Sarah," whose misery arose from the fact that her father would not allow her to go to the Army meetings to get converted.

Now, I do not for a moment contend that the Salvation Army has acquired a monopoly of irreverence, cant, or extravagance. I have this very week seen a Gospel "Free-and-Easy," advertised by a prominent East-End philanthropist. But the Army has led the way in a direction which it is only too easy to follow, and

[1] "Church Sunday School Magazine," Dec. 1881.

has stimulated an appetite which can only be satisfied by new developments of similar extravagance.

The Orders and Regulations (page 110) clearly show that extravagance is adopted by the Army as a part of its regular system, in order to attract and to excite. This is done, no doubt, in recognition of a principle which has been thus expressed. To entice irreligious persons it is of no use to employ a spiritual bait. The same argument has been urged in defence of the extravagance of the extreme Ritualists. Perhaps, after all, it is only a question of degree and not of principle; but, it is obvious to remark, that the extravagance which attracts by its novelty to-day, will pall upon the sated appetite ere long, and new outbursts of eccentricities will be demanded. Even the Salvation Army will discover that its processions and its banners, its vagaries and its oddities, will lose their force; and such startling announcements as "Samson's Wife," and "Hallelujah Lasses," and "A Taste of the Cod's Head," will fail in attractive power, just in proportion as they become familiar. Can we go so far as to admit that the attractive form of religion is to be overwhelmed and buried in a general scramble for the most fantastic and extravagant dress which can be devised for her to wear? Every one knows that anything which is unusual will attract a crowd. It did not need the Salvation Army to teach us that.

But the excitement and stir and fuss produced by the extravagancies of the Salvation Army have been defended upon other grounds. "Was there not excitement on the day of Pentecost?" triumphantly asks the General. "Is not the story of the early Church filled with scenes of excitement?" Yes, no doubt; but here we have another example of the illogical use of that sacred narrative. When we read of the Apostles marching about Jerusalem with banners and brass bands, and doing all in their power to arouse and to excite, then, it will be allowable to appeal to the excitement of their days as a justification of that encouraged and forced by human extravagance to support a work which claims to be Divine.

There are not wanting signs to show that even the best friends of the movement are beginning to doubt "whereunto this thing will grow." The loud "Amens" and "Hallelujahs" are already beginning to lose their force. The chorus of cadets which plays the part of the professional *claqueur* will utter these ejaculations with a stolid expression of countenance which proves them to be altogether unmoved. Therefore, more exciting and boisterous proceedings must be allowed and encouraged. To such a length has this already gone that even so warm a supporter as Mr. Stevenson Blackwood enters his protest against the "uproarious boisterousness and romping allowed to take place," in spite of his remonstrance, at a recent meeting of the Congress. Most

sober-minded persons will agree with him as to the impropriety of the antics of a "converted sailor, who accompanied the singing of a hymn by a kind of hornpipe, relieved by violent jumps into the air, which was concluded by a hand-to-hand dance on the platform with a male comrade in the army." We cannot but agree with him in deploring such an exhibition of "religious buffoonery."

It is a matter of some importance to estimate the effect of all this upon the minds of the classes whom it is especially intended to attract. It was my misfortune for many years to be brought so closely and so constantly into contact with the operations of the Army, that I have had abundant opportunity of judging; and though I say it with deep regret, I say it also without the least hesitation, that the tendency has been to bring religion itself into ridicule and contempt. The lads and young men who follow the steps of the Army corps and mimic their antics, and sing profane parodies upon their hymns, may be only intending to ridicule the Army; but it is an easy step from ridicule of the Army to contempt of the religion which they represent, and to the hardened disregard of any appeals which may be made to heart and conscience. And I believe that men who have been accustomed to conduct open-air services in districts which the Army has occupied, will agree that this work has been made much more difficult because of the hostility which has been needlessly provoked. Not many years ago, and the man who ventured to deliver his message in the open air was received if not with welcome at least with forbearance and respect; but now it is by no means so certain that he will secure a hearing; and he must at least be prepared to find every obstacle and opposition thrown in his way.

Time and space would fail for a careful examination into the doctrinal basis upon which the movement rests. It has been often said, in its defence, that, at any rate, a free and full salvation through the atonement of our Saviour is clearly proclaimed. Yes, assuredly, and from all who love the cause of Christ, the answer must come in the language of the Apostle—"Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice; yea, and will rejoice." And it is said that the Army seeks to keep to the proclamation of this simple truth, and does not desire to crystallize into a sect and form a new Church. But is such a simple solution possible? Is it in accordance with the facts? We recognize as fully as General Booth can do the paramount necessity which is laid upon every soul to use every opportunity of making known the message of salvation; but it is absolutely impossible that any religious society can be bound together in an organized community by a link so slight. And as a matter of simple fact, there has been a distinct advance from the teaching of this fundamental truth,

and there has been a clear tendency, both in doctrine and in organization, for the limp and flaccid teaching of the Salvation Army to stiffen into a sect. Men who preach the peculiar doctrines of the Army about holiness, and give their testimony to the possibility of perfect purity of heart and life,[1] have at least gone some steps beyond the simple teaching of the atonement through Jesus Christ. The truth is, that a Bible Reading Society must learn something more than this, and the soldiers of the Army will not be satisfied, and ought not to be satisfied, without an administration of the Sacraments, the duty of which is so clear. The experience of all evangelistic movements is the same in this respect, that those who have been rescued by them will demand the privileges and the rights of Church membership. I maintain, then, that the doctrinal basis of the Army teaching is (1) Insufficient, so far at least as it carries out its own profession, and is contented with this one truth alone. (2) The doctrinal basis is insecure, because it is liable to be shifted as the needs of the Army are developed, and as the opinion or feeling of the General in command may change. There is absolutely no standard of doctrine or rule of faith, beyond what the General may himself elicit from the Bible, or fancy that he gathers from it. But (3) The doctrinal basis is erroneous. How sadly so, those who have been able to examine the literature of the cause, too clearly know. It would be out of place to discuss here the teaching of the Army with regard to holiness and sanctification. Let it suffice to make one or two extracts in support of the statement that the doctrine of it taught is erroneous and dangerous. The General's definition of holiness we have already given. In the catechism entitled "Holy Living," page 29, he asks:—

> What other objections are made to the doctrine of holiness?
>
> Objectors say that they have never seen a holy person, that is, one who lives *without* sin.
>
> What reply would you make to this?
>
> I should say:—
>
> 1. That I was afraid they had not chosen as their associates those who believed in the possibility of being holy on earth, and, therefore, they were not likely to meet with many who had attained holiness; and
>
> 2. I should say that I was afraid that if they had met with a sanctified soul, their prejudices had prevented them recognizing him as such. We see the power of prejudice in the case of the Scribes and Pharisees, who, when they saw the Saviour, who unquestionably was without sin, yet said of Him, "He hath a devil."

Or again, page 4:—

> What is partial sanctification?

[1] "Heathen England," p. 181.

It is being delivered from the *power* of sin, but yet having sin *existing in the soul;* sin is *there* but it does not *reign.*

What is entire sanctification?

Entire sanctification supposes *complete* deliverance. Sin is *destroyed* out of the soul, and all the powers, faculties, possessions, and influences of the soul, are given up to the service and glory of God.

Or again[1]:—

The conqueror came, not only that He might save us from the punishment of sin, but from the sin itself. *You never need sin any more.* Here is a *Saviour* for you. Do you hear? YOU NEVER NEED SIN ANY MORE.

I refrain from comment, and only repeat that the doctrinal basis of Salvation Army teaching is (1) insufficient, (2) insecure, and (3) unsound.

I do not stay to dwell upon minor blemishes which mark the work of the Salvation Army, but I have touched upon these points, because they seem to me to be not mere excrescences, which might be removed without injury, but to be of the very essence of the system, without which it must fall and perish altogether. There are other questions, no doubt, which require very serious thought and grave consideration. Amongst such are—1. The ministry of women, and especially as regards preaching. 2. The spirit of self-complacency, not to say boastfulness and spiritual pride which the system encourages. "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall." 3. The danger of a religious system which depends to a great extent upon emotion and feeling, to the neglect or disparagement of the intellect and the reason. 4. The position of the General as the head of the whole movement.

I pass these by and proceed to the more grateful duty of trying to ascertain what are the causes of its success, and what the Church of England may learn from the movement.

Mr. Railton has a chapter in which he discusses the question, "Why we succeed."[2] He says, "The Army has been a great success, of course simply because God has made, and led, and sustained it." But going farther into details he sets forth the following reasons which deserve careful study:—

"1. The Army succeeds by aiming at immediate results." "2. The Army succeeds by making the most of its converts;" and under this head he gives some very practical and useful directions as to the employment of all who have been reached. "3. The Army succeeds by teaching converts to be holy;" and the practical effect of this teaching is the spirit of self-sacrifice which abandons drink and tobacco and showy dress, and gives itself up to advance the cause with a devotion

[1] "Salvation Soldiery," p. 129. [2] "Heathen England," p. 134.

and eagerness of which it is impossible to speak too highly. "4. The Army succeeds by teaching its hearers to do their utmost towards meeting the expenses of the work." The practical application of this rule is that an officer is dispatched to a particular town to commence work without any guarantee as to salary or expenses, and draws from the town itself the money required for its own capture.

Without at all disparaging the value of these four reasons, I would be inclined to attribute great force to the attraction of the extravagances which to my mind discredit and deface the whole system. Notoriety is the agent as well as the result of success. But there are other causes which it is of the utmost practical importance to observe.

I. The simplicity and grandeur of the object at which it aims. "To subdue a rebellious world to God." "To liberate a captive world and to overcome the enemies of God and man." What can be more inspiring than an aim like this?

II. The entire devotion of the leaders to the cause; and to this I would add especially the characters of Mr. and Mrs. Booth. They believe in their cause, they believe in themselves, and they believe in the power of God the Holy Ghost. No one can possibly mistake their desires and their motives. It is no wonder that they inspire enthusiasm; no wonder if those who dislike their system and denounce their doctrine are ready to pay tribute of admiration to their devotion and their zeal. Some men are born to command. William Booth is a born leader of men. Whether it be in directing an enormous multitude, whose enthusiasm he is able to control, so as to excite or appease it at his will; or whether it be in the quick, sharp, clear word of command, which men obey without dispute, before they have time to think of disobeying; or whether it be in the plain, practical, business-like common sense which marks so many of his utterances; or whether it be in the mastery of details, which is evidenced in the orders and regulations, where nothing seems to be forgotten; in all these things we see the power of the man which ministers to the success of the cause which he directs.

I wish that space allowed me to transcribe in full the two addresses entitled "The Salvation Army," and "How to Command a Corps of the Salvation Army," in "Salvation Soldiery." They will well repay the careful study of every clergyman. I will merely set forth the heads in the hope that the details will receive further study. In the first-named paper Mr. Booth discusses what should be done with 5,000 men and women prepared to work for Christ. And he says there should be (1) Combination; (2) Oneness of direction; (3) Training; (4) Sorting; (5) Obedience; (6) Discipline; (7) Work. On the last head he says, "Nothing demoralizes salvation soldiers more

than inactivity. Idleness is stark ruin, and the devil's own opportunity." Then in "How to Command an Army Corps," he says:—"(1) Get one. The man who makes a corps has the best qualification for managing one; (2) Magnify your office; (3) Love your corps; (4) Know your corps; (5) Teach your corps; (6) Work your corps; (7) Care for your soldiers; (8) Govern your corps. Concerning this last paper, Mr. Booth says that it is "the faithful working out of these plans which has produced the Salvation Army of to-day." Certainly they abound with practical wisdom, and with that knowledge of human nature which goes far to secure success.

III. Notice further that it is a movement *of* the people as well as *for* the people. Lord Shaftesbury has been proclaiming for many years past his belief that if the working classes were ever brought to Christ, it must be by means of the working class themselves. Many who have had to deal with working people have recognized the truth, and to the extent of their capacity have acted upon it. Mr. Booth has placed it beyond all doubt, and, in doing so, has removed from the working classes the reproach that they are hostile to religion. Unbelief does to a certain extent prevail, indifference abounds, but the Salvation Army proves that there is deep down in the heart something which speaks of God to which an appeal can be addressed.

IV. The freedom and elasticity, even the stir and noise of their religious meetings, minister to their success. Our dear old Church of England has been in grave danger of dying of her respectability. It is time for her to shake off what is pure habit and conventionality, and give herself in her strength to face a new position. Mr. Booth has clearly grasped the fact that an ordinary church or chapel service was addressed to and adapted for believers, and that outsiders must be drawn by some other means.

V. But, after all, the grand agents in the success of the army, have been the converts themselves. Having already pointed out the danger to the Army, and to religion, from the premature advancement of professing converts to occupy the post of teachers, I feel that I am the more entitled to draw attention to this feature as an element of success.

"Such ought to be set to work," says Mr. Booth, "whether they offer their services or not. Indeed, you must not wait for soldiers to find out what they can do, and to offer themselves; *you* must make the discovery, and hunt them out of their retirement, and bring them to the front, and use them to help you in the great conflict, for which you will require every agency on which you can possibly lay your hands. Get fixed in your mind the ungainsayable truth that every soldier can do something. Find out what that something is, and get him at it as quickly as possible."

From such words as these there is much to learn. The boast of the Church of England has been, that she has cared and provided for the poorest classes. The boast and pride of the Salvation Army is, that it has taught the people to provide for themselves.

But surely we may learn for the future of our own Church, such lessons as this religious movement has to teach, without giving up our grand history, or our orderly worship, or our clear statements of doctrine, in order to trim our sails to catch the breezes wafted by the Salvation Army. Unless we are prepared to abandon altogether the parochial system of the Church, it is absolutely impossible to adopt the Salvation Army or its plans.

What, then, is to be our attitude as Churchmen? I believe one of prayerful watchfulness and zeal.

However strongly we may sympathize with its objects, however warmly we may admire its leaders, we cannot stand upon its platform, without condoning very serious offences both in doctrine and in plans.

In this movement, whatever in it is of God will stand, and we may hope will be strengthened and increase. Whatever is not of God will come to naught, and I believe that none of us could desire or pray more heartily than Mr. and Mrs. Booth themselves, that God's will only may be done by the great organization under their direction. It may be that this great agency, purged of all that now renders it distasteful, or makes it dangerous, is destined in God's providence to play an important part in the winning of the world to Christ. In the meantime, whilst we dare not accept its plans, we cannot but sympathize with its aims; and it will be no small result for it to have achieved, if, by means of its agency, emphasis should be given to some simple truths, and the way opened for more earnest and systematic efforts on the part of those who are interested in the strengthening the hold of the Church of England upon the working classes of our country.

JOHN F. KITTO.

ART. IV.—A SUMMER TOUR IN RUSSIA.

A Summer Tour in Russia. By ANTONIO GALLENGA, Author of "South America," &c. Pp. 425. Chapman & Hall, 1882.

OF good works on Russia the store is rather large. The work of Mr. Mackenzie Wallace, valued by the late Emperor Alexander II. as "the best that can, was, or could be written," is an excellent one, readable, trustworthy, and full. But Mr.

Wallace's "Russia" is the Russia of ten years ago; and within the last two or three years the Great Northern Empire has gone through a crisis, the causes of which it would have been difficult to foretell, and the consequences of which one cannot calculate. The volume before us, an ably-written narrative of a tour in Russia last summer, may be regarded as an appendix to Mr. Wallace's work, while it has an interest and value of its own. Mr. Gallenga pleasantly brings before his readers the present-day condition of the people, both the emancipated serfs and the dwellers in towns; his sketches of social life are fresh, and lively; and his remarks on the prospects of the Empire are well-grounded and sagacious.

About travelling in Russia Mr. Gallenga gives a good deal of information in a chatty and agreeable style. From St. Petersburg to Moscow the distance is about 604 versts, or 400 English miles; and the night train travels over it in fifteen hours, or at the rate of twenty-six miles an hour, including stoppages, which is considered fair average speed on the Continent, and which is not attained on any other Russian line. In posting times, all that horse-flesh, by the most strenuous exertions had been able to achieve was the conveyance of the imperial mails between the two cities in five days and five nights, or 120 hours, the rate being three and a half miles per hour. To the comforts of the line between Moscow and St. Petersburg no line in either hemisphere comes up. Roomy and lofty saloon carriages; a window-seat, a *fauteuil* lit, a hand-luggage net for every traveller; a toilet room; a ladies' room at the end of each compartment; regular halts at convenient intervals; the finest stations; the best supplied and cheapest refreshment rooms; the loftiest, widest, cleanest, light-roofed platforms to circulate and stretch one's legs in; and everything everywhere contrived to protect the traveller from winter cold or summer heat.

A great improvement, all this, says Mr. Gallenga, upon the cramped, open sledge of other days, with the thermometer thirty degrees below the freezing-point, and the chill creeping in and curdling your blood under your fur coat, cap, and boots; the snow and sleet pelting your face, a pack of wolves howling in the rear, ready to take the hindmost, and the motion of the sledge over snow-drifts and bare hard-frozen ruts causing you to bob up and down like a buoy on the surging waves, with now and then the chances of an upset, and "many passengers troubled as if with sea-sickness;" yet even these miseries were preferable to summer travelling in the terrible *tarantass*,[1] as

[1] Of the tarantass and the droski Mr. Gallenga does not write in very favourable terms. The tarantass is a roomy, heavy vehicle with a hood and apron, somewhat like a large phaeton, but without seats. It stands on a score of long poles, somewhat elastic, laid out side by side like a raft

they call a springless post-chaise, with the stifling heat and blinding glare of a twenty-two hours' day, and the dust both stifling and blinding, and the jolting which broke every bone in your skin.

Of all or some of these delights of Russian travelling in the good old times, says our author, a stranger may still make ample experience at the present day, if he ventures beyond the railway track, or even if he tries any other line than that between the two capitals—hardly excepting even the international ones coming from Germany or Austria, or those branching from St. Petersburg to the Baltic regions. Everywhere except on the model line above described, the rate of speed is distressingly slow, the stoppages outrageously frequent and unconscionably long, the shelter, the cleanliness, the fare at the buffets, the general arrangement at the stations being by no means better than it should be—indeed, considerably worse than it need be.

In railway travelling through Russia the less a stranger looks out on the land the more favourable impression, perhaps, he will carry away about it. The towns along the line are almost invariably miles away from the stations, too much out of sight and in too low positions to be ever noticed, and, as a rule, too hopelessly like one another, too destitute of interest, to deserve even the few minutes' visit that the train might allow. And as for the country, the panorama is almost everywhere the same dreary flat from end to end, for the line runs, as a rule, through the lowest, dullest, districts. Of the series of views exhibited before the traveller as the train wafts him wearily along—views, however, not calculated to give the tourist a correct notion of things—Mr. Gallenga writes the following description:—

A dead flat, hardly broken at distant intervals by a wave of the ground, by some long low ridge, or small scrubby knoll; interminable, monotonous woodland; not primeval forest, but mere young birch and fir, stunted and ragged, with here and there a bit of rough clearing, a patch of coarse pasture, anon, great ryefields, stretching beyond man's ken, chequered here and there by more or less abortive attempts at wheat, barley, or potato crops; the ground, as a rule, without hedge, fence, or wall—nobody's or everybody's ground—open to the inroad of cattle; a sandy, salty, to all appearances irreclaimable, soil; a backward, slovenly cultivation; the cattle neither well-bred nor well-fed; everywhere a sense of loneliness; only at vast distances log-houses and barns, mostly untenanted, horses, cows, sheep, turkeys and geese

---

over the axletrees and between the wheels. The tossing and jolting is very nearly the same as in the common Russian country-cart, but the comforts inside are those of a *coupé-lit*. It is the only safe conveyance on the generality of Russian roads. According to Mr. Wallace the droski stands midway between a cab and an instrument of torture.

in flocks, unattended; and farther off, straggling towns and villages, with high-domed churches and tall factory-chimneys; and near the stations great piles of wood, solidly ranged in rows of logs of different size and various colours, as high as houses, and not without some architectural pretensions, and some artistic attempt at quaint, tasteful patterns.

The ground, for large tracts, swampy, cut up by miry ditches, or soaked into shallow morasses, where the water stagnates as if at a loss to make up its mind whether to flow north or south, east or west; and meanwhile spreading out into vast meres or lagoons, in some of which green, weedy islets are lazily floating from shore to shore—islets which the rustics of the adjoining farms, like those of Holland, endeavour to catch as they drift past—mooring them, and annexing them to their mainland domains.

The "horrors" of Russian travelling, says our author, whether by rail or by post, sledge, and steamer, have been absurdly exaggerated. In many of the central provinces of the empire, and along the main tracts, it would be idle to talk of "roughing it" according to the doleful directions of a guide-book. The best hotels of Moscow and St. Petersburg are simply magnificent and in minor towns, at Kasan, Kief, Tiflis, Odessa, &c., not much worse than in Spain or Italy. Most of them have German, French, Swiss, or Italian landlords, and not unfrequently Tartar waiters; and you are brought face to face with your host, while if you know how to make yourself agreeable you are admitted to take your meals with the family, in the style of the real primitive *table-d'hôte*, a desirable arrangement, as the domestic fare is good, and there is no other "round table." The tariff of charges for board and lodging is nailed up in several languages in every room, as in German hotels, and the bills are handed over weekly. Even at the poorest villages and solitary post-houses, a traveller in Russia is never at a loss for fresh and wholesome brown (rye) bread, eggs in any quantity, and the best amber-coloured tea, in bright Bohemian tumblers, hissing hot from the *samovar* (charcoal-heated tea-urn), tea pure and deliciously flavoured.[1] Outside the travelling track, of course, the accommodation is of a more primitive kind; and an Englishman may have to "rough it" rather unpleasantly. The real drawbacks, however, in Russian travelling, speaking broadly, are uncleanliness and scantiness of water. Into some of the Russian inns, even of crowded towns, the guide-books tell us

[1] In the tea which comes overland from Kiakhta, the city on the border between the Asiatic-Russian and the Celestial Empire, there is an exquisite delicacy. The difference, we read, mainly arises from the fact that the caravan tea, exposed to the air, during its twelve months' journey in loose, clumsy, and much shaken bundles, gets rid of the tannin and other gross substances. Anyhow, tea drunk in Russia is better than can be had anywhere else.

with good reason that it would be rashness for ladies to set their foot. Even in some of the best hotels baths cannot be had; and as regards washing their faces, many of the natives seem satisfied to moisten one eye after another as if they had sore eyes and were applying rose-water. As to minor discomforts, there are neither books nor newspapers, except Russian ones, in Russian hotels; and what are called "reading-rooms" are generally used by billiard-players and smokers. The use of tobacco smoke is universal in Russia—common to both sexes; no public dining- or drawing-room is free from it; ladies have no scruple about asking for "a light" of the first male stranger they meet. Again, the traveller must either know the Russian language or have the aid of a commissioner or interpreter; in some of the best hotels and along the streets of the largest cities, French, or English, or German, will not enable the tourist to make his way. Further, travelling in Russia is expensive. The price of railway tickets, which was originally moderate, had to be raised to meet the Government's taxes. In regard to bills and fees, a stranger may have reason to lament his inexperience. There is no tariff for the *isvoshtchik*, or droski-driver; none at least that he will produce or abide by. You give him what he asks, and he will ask for more; give him what you like and treat him like a dog, and he will be satisfied; the soul of the serf is still in him, and any one who knows how to "bully" him he recognizes as a master.[1] All this may explain how it is that so few mere pleasure-tourists ever visit Russia. It is not uncommon to fall in with Anglo-Indian or other Eastern travellers, who, on their homeward journey by the overland route, or the Suez Canal, will steam across the Mediterranean and the Ægean, from Alexandria to Constantinople and Odessa, and hence take the train direct to Warsaw, Moscow, or St. Petersburg. But these birds of passage seldom stop for a few hours even in the principal cities. Of people from England with money and leisure, and fond of travelling, the proportion who make a tour in Russia is extremely small.

Writing from St. Petersburg, Mr. Gallenga refers to the effects of the climate in the following terms:—

[1] The German traveller Kohl ("Russia," by I. G. Kohl, London, 1844) tells how his innate politeness induced him to address a Russian postilion as "My good man," and beg him to "be so kind as to get on a little faster." The fellow only stared at him, and went on jogging at his own pace; when a Russian friend, who sat by the German's side, broke out in thundering voice:

"You brute, *you* scoundrel! If you don't drive faster—this minute—I'll have you flogged like a dog by the police at the next station."

This language had immediately the desired effect: the serf understood it well; he had found his master. Matters have not much mended in this respect, according to Mr. Gallenga, since the emancipation.

This is a country over a large part of which the extremes of heat and cold share the year between them, dooming man to unwholesome seclusion for the winter months, and only allowing him to breathe free air in the summer season, when the sultriness of the weather utterly unnerves and prostrates him. Between the intense cold that stiffens the limbs and numbs the faculties, and the glowing heat that takes away breath, and induces torpor and listlessness, there is in these latitudes no transition or preparation; and the human frame, not led by degrees, and not inured day by day to either extreme, equally suffers from exposure to both.

In his hermetically sealed apartments, with double windows, and hot stoves within doors, and his panoply of furs swathing him up to his very eyes out of doors, the Russian in winter is perpetually consuming his own breath; and when at last he breaks out from long hibernation, from that endless night when no man can work, he finds himself hardly fit for the exertions demanded by that interminable day which allows man no rest.

What I here say applies to city life, and especially to the habits of the capital, with which I have already become tolerably well acquainted. I am not questioning the native vigour or hardihood of the Slavic race, or doubting that either dire necessity or stern discipline can enable a valiant nation to get the better of atmospheric influences, and by dint of energy and constant exercise to derive strength from those very inclemencies that tend to weaken it. I am aware that this is the spot where the officers of the Guards of the Emperor Nicholas used to go about in their glittering uniforms, "while the frost was hard enough to cripple a stag," with never a rag of a cloak to be seen about them; for the Czar himself, in emulation of his mad father, the Emperor Paul, exposed himself to wind, snow, hail, and storm, and expected from his officers the same disregard of the severity of a Polar winter. And I am aware that the Russian soldiers, chiefly levied among the northern peasantry, can be made to endure the greatest hardships, both on the march and at the bivouac, being in that respect more than a match for their most stubborn Ottoman opponents.

Still what I see here day by day satisfies me that these Russians, in the towns and as a people, are more susceptible, more afraid of heat and cold, more self-indulgent than any other set of men in the world.

A stranger from other countries can hardly travel in Russia anywhere by train, even in June or July, without being nearly asphyxiated by his fellow-passengers, who insist on putting up all the glasses of the double windows during the night; and who, when the sun is high at noon, lie lolling in their seats with outstretched arms and legs, like stranded porpoises, unable to move or talk, or probably, if they tried ever so hard, even to think. And the same collapse of all human strength is equally observable here in St. Petersburg, a Sybarite city, where every man, woman, or dog, every butcher and basket, every laundress and bundle, seems rich enough to afford the luxury of a droski; and where the *rari nantes* on the side-walks crawl and shamble on the legs of which the owners seem to have lost, or never to have acquired, the proper use.

Russia, it is often said, will have to be re-Russianized; but such a process cannot be easily applied to the upstart mongrel metropolis. Peter the Great created St. Petersburg a mongrel community, in which the European element vastly predominated. Germans enjoyed a special favour. Even as late as the reign of Alexander I., when that Emperor wished to requite the services of a veteran general, the blunt old soldier said "Sire, make me a German." Alexander and Nicholas only saw St. Petersburg and ignored the rest of the Empire. When they travelled through the provinces, their journeys were as rapid as post-horses, and, more lately, steam, could make them: their business was limited to grand reviews of regiments quartered in the cities, and to *levées* for the entertainment of the upper —*i.e.*, the official-classes. These Russian autocrats gave themselves little time or trouble to acquaint themselves with the wants of their subjects, or to guess their aspirations. Even Alexander II., a benevolent ruler, thought too much of the city on the Neva. Public opinion, however, is gaining strength. Against the Germans, throughout the Empire, the tide has set in strongly; and Russia has become intensely national.

St. Petersburg, as a capital, it is said, is a mistake. The cry "Back to Moscow!" resounds now, in not loud but deep notes, wherever one goes. "Holy Russia" is yearning for its "Holy City." In truth, Moscow is now the centre of Russian life and activity, wealth and productiveness. The time was when at the Court, and in the higher circles of St. Petersburg, the word "Moscovite" was used as a term of reproach, implying what was uncouth and barbarous; but our author heard a lady, sprung from one of the proudest historic Russian families, and, through her husband, closely connected with the Imperial Government, exclaim with emphasis, "*Je suis Moscovite! Bien Moscovite!*"

Moscow is described as eminently a religious city. The churches and chapels are crowded with worshippers. *Icons* or images are stuck up on every wall; and no common labourer or artisan, no water-carrier or droski-driver goes past without giving a sign of devotion. In spite of a great trade, however, Moscow swarms with beggars in every street. The besetting sins of the people, in fact, are idleness and drunkenness. For these vices, says Mr. Gallenga, "the priests are in a great measure responsible: the priests who multiply their church festivities to such an extent as to compel the faithful to keep holy as many as 170 days in the year,[1] who while imposing rigid fasts for as many days as they have feasts, and thus sapping the vigour and wearing out the very soul of

[1] 170 holy days, without reckoning the Sundays.

the working man, has never a word to say against the use and abuse of that *vodka*, or strong water, to which the labourers are driven by the delusive hope that liquor may make up for the deficiency of wholesome food." Differing herein from some travellers, Mr. Gallenga tells of the streets in Moscow on the evenings of Sunday and on other holidays full of men reeling in the last stage of intoxication. And if the priests, he says, were to preach against the *vodka*, they would have to add the clause, "Do as I say, not as I do!" The Russian Church, as is well known, is a Church of showy ceremonies, of outward observances, fasts, and pilgrimages, a mere show where hardly any appeal is ever made to the heart and understanding; a Church of which even Dean Stanley found fault for its "separation of religion from morality." The Russian Church, says Mr. Gallenga, has "neither the will nor the power to exercise a beneficial influence over the people."

In the costumes of a Russian crowd, we read, there is nothing very picturesque. For the quaintness of old Moscovitic costume, or gorgeous Eastern finery, a man must now-a-days be referred to picture-books:—

> The only article that distinguishes the Russian from an European, and especially from an English, crowd, is the head-gear; . . . . the necessity of one season sets the people here against the wear of our awkward, irrational, unbecoming chimney-pot for the remainder of the twelvemonth. The Russian costume of the lower classes consists of a black or white cap, with the brim drawn down on the brow and almost on the very eyes; a long, loose, shapeless dark-blue or brown-grey coat, flowing down to the heels, and heavy top boots up to the knees. . . . . Bating the colour or tissue, the same medley of international rags seems equally to suit Russian or Tartar, Moslem or Christian, gipsy or Jew. Merchants and brokers and idlers of the middle-class wear the cut-away jacket and wide-awake hat now common to all Europe.
>
> The clergy are easily distinguishable among the crowd, not only by their costume, but also by their mien and bearing; for many of them are tall and handsome, with blue eyes and sleek tawny hair and beard unclipped, and they have a grave, sedate air. . . . . The monks, or black clergy, wear long, flowing robes, and tall, cylindrical caps, from which a veil falls down, partly covering their countenance. The mere parish priests (white clergy) are dressed in the same manner but wear no veil.

In Russia, says our author, manufactures are killing agriculture. The towns, as yet, are few and far between; their inhabitants are vastly outnumbered by the rural population; there is hardly any middle-class in the cities; none whatever out of them; many of the great landowners are absentees; there is no country life as we understand it in England, only rustic life as in the

old Roman world. The Russian peasant, with a drop of Tartar blood in his veins, is by nature a nomad. Tied to the soil by the Czar Boris Godunoff, in 1601, he has been manumitted, and in a great measure made lord of the soil by the Emperor Alexander II., yet he does not take kindly to the soil. The land, indeed, requires intelligence and capital, and the peasants, in increasing numbers, migrate to the cities, where they can get a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. According to Keith Johnston agricultural and pastoral industries employ about 76 per cent., manufactures only about 15 per cent. of the population. But of those who are land-labourers, a certain proportion leave the country for the town during the winter season; and, away from their wives and children, work in mills and factories. The peasant, with a Tartar fondness for moving about, has also a feeling that in town-work he stands a chance of "bettering himself;" and, as a matter of fact, not a few of the emancipated serfs have become wealthy traders. The protective policy of the Empire at least secures an extensive market for Russian goods. In every branch of industrial enterprise Russia has achieved a singular success. The exhibition recently opened in Moscow is purely national; and the Imperial tariffs, as we have said, insure sufficiently both manufacturing and trading prosperity. But there is no capital to give the Russian soil a chance. According to Mr. Gallenga, American corn merchants are likely to prove more than a match for those of Russia. No doubt, in proportion as the railway system is extended, the resources of the Empire, which are immense, will be made more available, and the condition both of the rural and the urban labourer may, in many respects, improve. What is most of all needed, after a constitutional government, is a middle-class. For the Nihilists, and the *Tchin* system, we may refer to our own columns (CHURCHMAN, January, 1880).

ART. V.—THE CLAIMS OF THE CONVOCATIONS OF THE CLERGY AS TO THE PRAYER BOOK.

THE Preamble to the present Act of Uniformity, passed in 1662, tells us that the Book of Common Prayer of the day, which was, in fact, that of Queen Elizabeth, had been submitted by the King to the body of divines who are now known as the Savoy Commission, or "the Savoy Conference," in order that they might "review" the book, and "prepare such alterations and additions as they thought fit to offer;" and the same

Preamble, without telling us what was the result of that proceeding, then says that His Majesty had been pleased to "authorize and require" the Convocations of both the Provinces of Canterbury and York to "review" the Book of Common Prayer, and also the Book of Consecration and Ordination, which was, in fact, a part of Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book, and to "make such alterations and additions in the said book respectively as to them should seem meet and convenient," and to "*exhibit and present the same to his Majesty in writing, for his further allowance or confirmation;*" and then that they, "the Presidents, Bishops, and Clergy, of both Provinces, have, accordingly, reviewed the said books, and have made some alterations," and some additional prayers "to be used upon proper and emergent occasions, *and have exhibited and presented the same unto His Majesty in writing, in one book, intituled,*" &c. &c., "*all which His Majesty having duly considered, hath fully approved and allowed the same, and recommended to this present Parliament,* that the said books, with the alterations and additions, which have been so made and presented to His Majesty, be the book which shall be appointed to be used by all that officiate," &c., "under such sanctions and penalties as the Houses of Parliament shall think fit."

The Act of Uniformity afterwards directs that "all and singular Ministers in any Cathedral, Collegiate, or Parish Church or Chapel *or other place of public worship*" [to which College Chapels are subsequently expressly added] shall "say and use "The Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer," &c. &c., "in such order and form as is mentioned in the said Book annexed and joined to this present Act, and intituled," &c. Then follow the same words of title as had before been said to form the title of the book presented to the King by the two Convocations; a title which had some verbal differences from the title to the Prayer Book of Elizabeth.

In this way, the Act of Uniformity incorporated a book, bearing the title before mentioned; and the book annexed to the Act must be treated as part of the Act itself. Professor Swainson, in his "Parliamentary History of the Act of Uniformity" (ed. of 1875), seems to think it sufficiently clear that the book which was, in fact, annexed to the Act, was the book which had been presented to the King by the two Convocations, and by him recommended to Parliament, and sent to the House of Lords (p. 17); but that some alterations or additions were made to the book, by Parliament, between its being so transmitted by the King, and its becoming law by the passing of the Act to which it was annexed (*see* Swainson, p. 70 to 75.)

The preface to the book, thus annexed to the Act of Uniformity, *gives a different account of the revision.* It speaks in the name

of those who made it; and it is clear that, whoever they were, they were not the Convocations, or either of them; and, on the contrary, the only allusion that the preface makes to the Convocations, is in the concluding sentence, in which the Revisers say that "What is here presented hath been, by the Convocations of both Provinces, with great diligence, examined and approved" —an expression which shows that the revision was not made by the Convocations themselves, or either of them; because not only do the Revisers say that they themselves made it, but they say that the concern which the Convocations had in it was that of examination and approval; and it is obvious that there can be neither an examination nor an approval of any work before the work itself is done. The Revisers do not say, in their preface, who they were; but the circumstances of the case, to be hereafter stated, clearly show that they were some bishops; and that this must have been well known to both Houses of Parliament at the time.

The mention which the Revisers make of the two Convocations is not at all such as to imply that the approval of those bodies was a necessary condition precedent to the adoption of the revised Prayer Book by the nation; for they say that they *hope* that the approval of the Convocations, as well as the other reasons given for the efficient execution of the work, will make it acceptable "to all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England."

It is upon the statements thus appearing, in the Act of Uniformity, and in the preface to the book which it incorporates, that the modern theory is founded, that the revision of the Prayer Book, in 1661 and 1662, was the work of what is called in the singular number, "Convocation;" and this theory is enlarged into another, which is, that no revision or alteration of the Prayer Book *could* lawfully have been made by any other body or persons than "Convocation," and that no revision or alteration could have even been made binding by Parliament itself, unless it had been made by "Convocation;" and the advocates of this theory, in its thus enlarged form, have now extended it even still farther, by insisting that no Act of Parliament which in any way purports to affect the clergy in their clerical character, *can have any validity as regards them*, unless it shall have been made with the concurrence of "Convocation"—a delusion which seems incredible to constitutional lawyers of the old school.

The question whether, in fact, Parliament did make any alterations in the revised book, between the transmission of it, by the King, to the House of Lords, and the passing of the Act which incorporated it, seems to have been thought of much practical importance, and, accordingly, to have been investigated

with great minuteness. It is probable, from the details given to us by Professor Swainson, that some such alterations were, in fact, made; but his work upon the History of the Act of Uniformity seems to show that there are not wanting grounds for saying that, even if this were so, it was the House of Lords that made them, and that the bishops who sat in the House of Lords at that time, and who necessarily formed the Upper Houses of the two Convocations, took care to obtain, in some way or other, whether regularly or not, the concurrence of the Convocations, or of one of them, in the propriety of those alterations, and, consequently, that the alterations could not be demonstrated to have been made upon parliamentary judgment only, without some convocational acquiescence.

Any proof of such acquiescence would be unnecessary in principle, because the circumstances under which Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity was passed are conclusive evidence that Parliament, not only without the concurrence of the Convocations, but in opposition to both of them, can impose upon the bishops and clergy of the Convocations, and upon those whom they represent, the obligation of using any Prayer Book which Parliament, as representing the nation, may think fit: not parts of a book only, but the *whole* of a book; and if the whole, then, necessarily, any parts, and all parts.

The present book, with all its Rubrics, was to form, and does form, part of the Act of Parliament in which it was incorporated; and it cannot possibly be said, with truth, that the Houses of Parliament may not discuss and decide upon any part of an Act of Parliament which they pass.

If this reason were not conclusive, which it surely is, there is another, which is also final—namely, that neither House of Parliament was obliged to adopt any revised book at all; and the Houses, or either of them, might have rejected any and every revised book proposed to them, as repeatedly as they chose, until some book which they wholly approved should have been offered; and the rejection of any such book, or of any number of such books, would not, necessarily, have been unreasonable, because there was already in force a complete Book of Common Prayer, with all necessary services, including those of Ordination and Consecration.

When Charles II. had been restored, the Constitution of England, as regards the absolute power of Parliament, was the same as it had been at the accession of Elizabeth, and as it is now.

There is always a *moral limit* to the otherwise absolute power of Parliament; and the sense of the nation as to that moral limit in any particular matter, can, in these days, at all events, be easily made to influence the Members of both Houses

of Parliament. Absolute power *must reside somewhere*, even in the least arbitrary form of Government. In England it resides in the Parliament for the time being, as the embodiment of the national will.

The revision of the Prayer Book in 1661 and 1662, so far from being evidence of "Convocation's" exclusive right to revise, or to veto a revision, is not even a Parliamentary precedent for either of these things. It was a march stolen upon the Presbyterians by the bishops and Lord Clarendon, at a time when both Houses of Parliament were eager to pass an Act of Uniformity which should oblige existing Presbyterian incumbents to vacate their benefices. Incidentally, some variations were made, of an unobjectionable character, due partly to the natural desire of some Revisers to conceal their practical purpose, and partly to the wish of other Revisers to make permanent improvements.

It will presently be shown that the King's reference of the book to the two Convocations was *a mere incident in the course of this episcopal revision, and was adopted for the purpose of gaining delay*, until it should have been accomplished; a delay necessary to moderate the impatience of the House of Commons, who had already sent up to the House of Lords a Bill of Uniformity, intended to make additional provisions for enforcing immediate adoption of the existing unrevised book by the Presbyterian incumbents.

It is both inaccurate and misleading to use the word "Convocation," in the singular, to denote the Convocations of Canterbury and York, which are two separate, distinct, and independent representative bodies of the clergy, neither of which has any authority beyond the province by the name of which it is called. It is, therefore, intended that, in these observations, the Convocation of each Province shall be spoken of separately.

Queen Elizabeth's Liturgy was the book to be revised, and it was still in full force. The establishment of that liturgy was the declaration of the great constitutional principle, that the nation has a right to prescribe for itself whatever system of public worship it shall think fit, and whatever forms of prayer and ceremonies of devotion, it shall think proper to use, by whomsoever composed; and that that right may be so exercised by the nation, without the assistance of either of the two provincial convocations of the clergy, or of any other clerical co-operation whatever, and even in direct *opposition* to all the bishops of the realm for the time being, and, therefore, necessarily, in *opposition* to the convocations of which they form essential component parts, without whom the convocations themselves could not be constituted. The nation, in this

proceeding, offered ecclesiastical service to all who chose to undertake it upon the conditions thus laid down; which conditions it was free to all candidates for such service to accept or reject, and which, if they did accept, they must continue to perform, so long as they continued in the service. They might reject the service at first; they might discontinue it afterwards; but, so long as they continued it, the conditions were the essential part of the service. This has ever since been, and is now, the only accurate definition of that which is popularly, but inaccurately, called "Church and State," inaccurately called so, because the so calling it implies that "Church" and "State" are two bodies, capable of concord or discord; whereas they are one and the same body, the nation; of which identity the evidences, in our constitutional records, are innumerable, and the constant recollection of which identity is essential to all accurate reasoning upon questions which affect the nation's system of public worship and religious instruction.

The book which the nation, at Elizabeth's accession, established as their code of devotion, included, besides large parts of the Holy Scriptures, a great many prayers and hymns, composed in a great many different ages, *and which had become, at many different times, the public property of all Christians.* They had often been collected before, by different persons, or bodies of persons, in different books, some of which had contained only a part of them, and others of which had contained them all. They had been varied, more or less, at different times, and by different generations of men. Some of them were slightly varied for the purpose of the Elizabethan book itself.

The same observations are applicable to the very numerous directions, for the conduct of Public Worship, and the Administration of the Sacraments, and other rites of the Christian Religion, which the book of Elizabeth contained; including, as it did, the forms and directions for the Ordination of Priests and Deacons, and the Consecration of Bishops; and the book made those forms of ordination and consecration conditions precedent to the admission or consecration, from thenceforth, of all its future ecclesiastical servants who were not already in such holy orders as were recognized by the general law of the land. A slight doubt, started in 1565 or 1566, as to whether the forms of ordination and consecration were really in operation, because they were not expressly mentioned in Queen Elizabeth's *Act* of Uniformity, although they were included in her Prayer Book, and in general terms, in the title of that book, which describes itself as containing not only the Prayers and the Sacrament-Services, but also the "*other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England,*" was removed by an affirmative

declaration, in an Act of Parliament of the eighth year of the Queen.[1]

It is immaterial, in principle, whether the contents of the Elizabethan Prayer Book were new or old, whether they had been before collected or not, whether they had been used before or not. It is also immaterial, in principle, who the authors of the prayers or the hymns had been. In many cases, the authorship could not possibly be ascertained with certainty; in other cases, it was probably known to be that of men who had been living in Edward VI.'s reign. The nation, through its advisers in Parliament, was quite capable of satisfying itself, by proper inquiry and information, about the reasonableness of every part of the forms of the book, and of the directions which it contained, and of the direction, which, in some minor matters, the new Act of Uniformity empowered the Queen to make, upon receiving certain advice (sec. 25). All that *is* material, in principle, is, that the nation now, through its Parliament, adopted, for itself, a volume of services and directions for public worship and for private use, with proper provisions for securing "a due supply of fit persons to serve in the Sacred Ministry" of that part of the church universal which consisted of the "Particular or National Church," which was composed of the people of England. This book became, henceforth, the inheritance of all the people of England; and it became the birthright of all future generations of Englishmen to have public worship conducted in conformity with it, in their own parish churches, and in every other church or house of prayer, belonging to the nation, which their convenience might at any time induce them to attend.

This inestimable inheritance has continued to be ours, from the first year of Elizabeth until now, except in the particulars in which the nation was persuaded, through Parliament, to vary or add to it in the year 1662, and except in the revision of the Tables of Scripture Lessons which Parliament also made about ten years ago.

The mere statement of the circumstances under which Queen Elizabeth's Prayer Book became the Prayer Book of the nation, is conclusive to show that neither both nor either of the Convocations could possibly have any right, *at the time of the next revision,* which was that of 1661 and 1662, to control the nation, whose property the book was, in revising or otherwise dealing with it. A right which could not possibly exist could not possibly be evidenced.

---

[1] See Swainson, 43–4; see also 2 Rapin 75, notes; and see Preface to the Parker Society's Edition of the Liturgical Services of Queen Elizabeth, xxi., and the Act itself, 8 Eliz. c. i.

It is one of our strongest constitutional principles that Parliament is *uncontrollable*;[1] but it would not be uncontrollable, if the Convocations could control it.

These reasons are conclusive against the existence of any right of revision in the two Convocations of Canterbury and York, in the years 1661 and 1662.

But, notwithstanding this conclusive reasoning, popular opinion will ask, "What, then, were the proper functions of the Convocations, when this reference was made to them?" The answer may be given thus:—

Until the passing of the Act of the Submission of the Clergy, 25 Henry VIII., c. 19, in 1533, there were, or might be, two separate Convocations of the clergy in each province. One of these may be said to have been the Archbishop's Provincial Synod, convenable when he pleased, but probably with the leave or acquiescence of the King, and the other to have been the King's Taxing Convocation, regulated by a scheme of representation laid down by King Edward I., in 1295, and resembling very closely the scheme of representation already in practice with regard to the Archbishop's Provincial Synod. The Taxing Convocation was, in fact, Parliamentary only, and summoned for Parliamentary taxation, and was required by the King's writs, to be in attendance at the places prescribed by him, either in the province of Canterbury or in the province of York, as the case might be, or, more usually, in both provinces. The Lower House of each Taxing Convocation was re-elected at the commencement of every new Parliament, and continued during that Parliament's continuance, and no longer; but with occasional renewals of individual members, whenever death or resignation might require.

This Taxing Convocation still continues to be summoned, although taxation by it has long ceased. The mode of summons and election prescribed by King Edward I. still continues in respect to it. It is now the only kind of Convocation that meets.

Before the Act of Submission, the Archbishop's Provincial Synod made laws and constitutions which were allowed to affect the clergy, and some of which were acquiesced in by the laity also, so far as they were not repugnant to the King's prerogative or to the laws of the land—that is, to the common law or to the statute law; and, by the Act of Submission, that part of the then existing law made by the Provincial Synods, or adopted by them, which was not repugnant to the prerogative or to the common law, or to the statute law, was *temporarily* continued, until a certain body of thirty-two Commissioners

[1] See 1 Blackstone's "Commentaries," from 160 to 162.

should have reviewed the ecclesiastical law generally, which *temporary* continuance was revived by the very first Act of Parliament of Queen Elizabeth, the Royal Supremacy Act, 1 Eliz. c. 1; and, *upon the footing of this temporary continuance*, the old ecclesiastical law of the time before 25 Henry VIII., 1533, still stands, except so far as it may have been validly altered or added to by the canons of 1603-4, which will be presently mentioned, or by Acts of Parliament made from time to time, whose authority is supreme over all canons and all other ecclesiastical law.

The Act of Submission (25 Henry VIII., c. 19, 1533), precluded the Archbishop from summoning his Provincial Synod, without the authority of the Sovereign; and it also precluded the making of any canons, in *any* Convocation of the clergy, without the Sovereign's previous permission and subsequent ratification. It is very clear, from the results of the investigations of Professor Stubbs, in his "Constitutional History," and from the forms given in that work, and in his other work, called "Stubbs's Charters," that the only Convocation summoned since the Act of Submission has been the King's Taxing Convocation,[1] and that that Convocation which we have called, in distinction, the Archbishop's Synod, has never since met; but, inasmuch as the system of election prescribed for the King's Taxing Convocation was substantially the same as that already in practice for the election of the Archbishop's Synod, it became as effectual to give licence for making canons to the King's Taxing Convocation, and to make a subsequent ratification of them, as if the same licence and ratification had been given in the case of canons made in the Archbishop's Synod. The Act of Submission prohibited making any canons, even with licence and ratification, which were repugnant to the King's prerogative, or the common, or the statute law; repeating the qualification already mentioned as that of the temporarily continued ecclesiastical law. The Act of Submission has, in practice, been considered as amounting to a reservation of a power of making canons *not so repugnant* as just mentioned, provided they shall have been previously licensed, and subsequently confirmed. Accordingly, the royal permission has been occasionally given to the Taxing Convocations to make canons, or to do some other particular business. Some canons seem to have been so made in Queen Elizabeth's time; but, whatever they were, they were incorporated in the canons of 1603-4, which is a large body of ecclesiastical law, and contains the latest set of canons which have any validity. A set of canons was irregularly attempted to be made in 1640, partly during the sitting, and partly after

[1] See 2 Stubbs, 195 to 200; 3 Stubbs 319, Edition of 1878.

the sitting, of the "Short Parliament" of 1640, but, by an early Act of Charles II. (13 Car. II. c. 12), it was expressly provided, in double terms, that no canons should be put in force that were not in force in 1639, and that nothing in that Act should be taken to confirm the canons of 1640.

The canons of 1603-4, therefore, are not only the latest body, but the only body, of canons, now in force, *as such.* They embody a great part of the then existing ecclesiastical law, although not quite the whole of that law.

It has been conclusively settled by the highest tribunal, the House of Lords, in addition to the authority of other courts, that the canons of 1603-4 do not, in any way, affect the laity, or the rights of the laity, because the laity have never been represented in the Convocations by which they were made, except so far as they were embodiments of the then law of the land, affecting clergy and laity alike. This is what is meant by saying that the canons do not, *proprio vigore*, bind the laity. If it is, at any time, asserted, that a proposition of law to be found in one of the canons, by which a right of the laity would be affected, was part of the law of the land in 1603-4, *that* question is examinable; and it may be determined that it was *not* then part of the law of the land, and consequently cannot affect the rights of the laity. This was what was done in the great case of the Bishop of Exeter *v.* Marshall, in the House of Lords, in the years 1867 and 1868, in which the House, with the assistance of the common law judges, determined that the Bishop of Exeter had no right to refuse the presentation of a patron, on the ground that the presentee did not bring with him a particular kind of testimonial, even if it had been clear that the canons prescribed it. Upon similar principles, it had been before decided that a prescription by a canon, of a particular limit of distance for pluralities of benefices, was void, because no such limit had been prescribed to the patron and incumbent by the law of the land: and there have been other decisions, at different times, to the same effect—namely, that the Convocations of the clergy cannot in any way affect the rights of the laity. But if the clergy, in their Convocations, could require the laity to alter the Divine Service of the nation in any particulars, or could impose upon the laity, in their character of the nation, a *veto* upon any alteration which the nation might wish to make, they *would* affect the rights of the laity, that is, the λαὸς, the nation, whose ecclesiastical servants they are, and of whom, in their personal character, as distinguished from their ecclesiastical character, they themselves form a part.[1]

[1] Sir William Blackstone, more than a hundred years ago, concluded his

In presumption of law, as the law existed in 1661, the Convocation of each province was always in attendance, during the sittings of Parliament, and in readiness to consider the question of granting a supply to the Sovereign, whenever informed that his necessities, or those of the country, required it. *In practice*, the members of each Convocation probably attended at intervals only, or upon special notice. When taxing duty was not required of them, they exercised themselves in making, or attempting to make, canons, if authorized to do so; and, at other times, in the discussion of some of those many questions in which so large a body of men as the clergy were sure to be, from time to time, interested. Such discussions were, in effect, mere conversations and interchanges of conflicting opinion, and were sure to be often as barren of result as similar discussions in any other profession would be, although the want of an opportunity for them would have been felt as a grievance. Very probably the discussions were fomented and prolonged by some members who would gladly see the restoration of that system of spiritual despotism called "discipline," which had been exercised by Provincial Synods, over laity, as well as clergy, before the Act of Submission.

These employments would be sufficient to keep the two Convocations in a state of accessibility, to be made use of by the Crown, if necessary, either for money or for advice.

The Convocation of one province might, if it thought fit, follow the example of the Convocation of the other province, in doing or recommending anything within its own powers, as, practically, was often (but not always) the case, when the Convocation of York followed the example of the Convocation of Canterbury, in making a grant to the King, subject, in each case, to the confirmation of Parliament, which alone could enforce it; and it will be seen that, in the Acts of Parliament for confirming such grants, it was the practice to provide for the enforcement of an expected grant from York by the Act which enforced a grant from Canterbury. These Confirmation Acts are not always found at length in the printed collections of statutes, because they were of temporary duration only; but they may be read in the Record Commissioners' edition.[1]

---

statement about the *in*validity of the canons, as regards the *laity*, with the words "whatever regard the clergy may think proper to pay them" (1 Blackst. Com. 83). The authorized report of the Bishop of Exeter's case is in "The Law Reports, Appellate Series, House of Lords English and Irish Appeals and Claims of Peerage," vol. iii. The final decision was on March 30, 1868.

[1] An instance of a prospective confirmation of a grant from York will be found in the Record Commissioners' edition of the Statute 1 Car. I. c. 5 (1625) in these words:—"And be it further enacted, by the authority aforesaid, that all and every grant and grants of all and every sum and

Professor Christian, in his Notes to Blackstone's Commentaries, has mentioned, as a proof of the independence of the Convocations of the two provinces, that Canterbury and York did not always grant subsidies of the same amount on the same occasions.[1]

In 1661, when the King summoned his first Parliament after the dissolution of the Convention Parliament, he also, *necessarily*, summoned the two Convocations of the clergy; because the effect of the Restoration had been to restore the then existing privilege of the clergy to be taxed, for the purposes of the King or the State, only through such recommendations to Parliament as should be made by the Convocations of their respective provinces; and the only proper time for summoning the Taxing Convocations, and for making the necessary elections of Proctors in Convocation, was the time at which the new Parliament was summoned and elected. It must, of course, have been expected that, sooner or later, during the existence of the new Parliament, it would be necessary to ask for a supply of money from the clergy, as well as from the laity. It was intended, no doubt, to postpone that necessity as long as possible; and, accordingly, in the meantime, an Act passed, on the 8th of July, 1661, for permitting His Majesty to accept a "Benelovence" from his subjects, if they should think fit to give it; a permission which Parliament alone could grant, because, otherwise, the Benevolence was forbidden by the Petition of Right (3 Car. I., 1628). In the year 1663, however, taxation, of the ordinary compulsory kind, became inevitable; and, accordingly, it will be seen, in referring to the Public General Statutes of the year 1663, 15 Car. II., that Chapter IX. is "an Act for *confirming* of four subsidies granted by the clergy," following next after Chapter VIII., which is "an Act for granting four entire subsidies to His Majesty by the temporalty."

It was not till after the year 1663 that that arrangement was made, between Archbishop Sheldon and the civil Government, by which it came to be understood that the clergy should thenceforth submit to be taxed together with, and as part of, the general subjects of the Crown, upon the terms of their

---

sums of money *granted, or which hereafter shall be granted*, to the King's Majesty, *by the clergy of the province of York*, shall be of the same strength, force, and effect, in all things, as the said grant made by the said province of Canterbury, and shall be taxed, certified, collected, levied, gathered, and paid, according to the tenor, form, and effect of this present Act of Parliament, to all intents, constructions, and purposes, in such manner and form as though it were specially, plainly, and particularly expressed and rehearsed in this present Act, by express words, terms, and sentences, in their several natures and kinds."

[1] See 1 Bl. Com. 280, Notes to 14th edition, 1803.

being allowed to vote in the election of Members of Parliament, in respect of their benefices; an understanding which has now been acted upon, for more than two hundred years, and has, in that way, acquired the force of law.[1]

No doubt, the Convocation of Canterbury, which met at the same time as the Parliament of May, 1661, made itself very useful to the Crown, when, in accordance with the Act of Parliament permitting the Benevolence, it determined, on the 27th of July, 1661, two days after the expiration of the Savoy Commission, to present a Benevolence accordingly (see Swainson, 14). This was setting a good example to His Majesty's lay subjects, very desirable just then; as we know from Pepys's Diary, under date of the 31st of August, 1661.

The Canterbury Convocation of May, 1661, while waiting for the employment of their pecuniary services, had been kept in good humour by the Crown, by means of giving them some congenial work to do; for we find, by the Records of Convocation, quoted by Professor Swainson (p. 14), that "on June 7, a licence under the Great Seal, *to amend the canons*, was sent to Convocation;" and that, "for some reason or other, this licence was suspended; for, on June 19, another or second licence was produced to amend the canons."[2]

Whenever it was likely that Parliament would make any alteration of the law, *which would affect the duties or the interests of the clergy*, it would be reasonable that they should, like any other profession, have an opportunity of expressing their opinions about it, *unless they were known to be absolutely hostile to any alteration at all—as at Queen Elizabeth's accession was notorious.*

It will thus appear that it could *not* have been part of the constitutional duty of the two Convocations of the Clergy, at any time after the Uniformity Act of Queen Elizabeth, to prescribe the system of the nation's public worship, or to alter or amend it.

It will be equally clear, upon a moderately careful attention to the terms in which the Preamble to the present Act of Uniformity speaks of the reference made by the King to the two Convocations, that the utmost meaning of those terms is, that

---

[1] See Burnet's "Own Time," vol. iv. p. 508. Oxford ed., 1823. (*Speaker Onslow's note.*)

[2] He refers, for the terms of this license, to Cardwell's *Synodalia*, and he adds that "nothing was to be done, except in the presence of either Juxon, Sheldon, Pierce, or Wren," and then that, on July 17, some canons were produced, discussed, and recommitted, as also on July 19 and 22. Then comes the statement that the "Benevolence" was agreed to on July 27, and that the Upper House "met for the last time before the Vacation, on July 30."

the reference was made for his own guidance only, in the prospect of a recommendation to Parliament, about to be made by him, just as he might have consulted any individual person, or any body of persons, upon that subject, or any other, and with a view to exercising his own judgment upon the advice he might receive; and that Parliament could be no more limited in its power of acting upon or rejecting the King's recommendation, by the circumstance of his having consulted the two Convocations, than if he had had any other adviser or advisers.

The proof that this was the case, at the very utmost, which the Preamble to the Act affords, ought to be conclusively sufficient: because the language of the Preamble is the language of Parliament, consisting of King, Lords, and Commons.

There is no precedent, in the Constitution of this country, for saying that the consent of the Convocations, or either of them, has ever been essential to the validity of any Act of Parliament, at any time since the Reformation, even if before, which is not probable; except that, in practice, the *taxation of the clergy* by Act of Parliament may be said to have obtained a prescriptive right to the previous assent of the Convocations, in those days in which the clergy were taxed by this double process: a right which, as has just been shown, was abandoned more than two hundred years ago, and is not now insisted upon. It would have been strange, indeed, if the accident of King Charles II.'s having consulted the Convocations of 1661, should have subverted, in this respect, the Constitution of England. *It was not in the king's power* to make any such alteration. It is evident that he never thought he was making it; and it is also evident, from the language of the records of Parliament, that both Houses considered the revised book as *the King's book*. The King had never been empowered by Parliament to submit the book to the Convocations—nor had Parliament ever so submitted it. The King, of his own head, had chosen to consult the Convocations; and his telling Parliament that he had used the Convocations as his advisers, was merely intended to be an additional argument with them for adopting it. In complete consistency with this view, is the language which both Houses of Parliament constantly employed, when, in referring to the revised book, they spoke of it as being the King's book, or as recommended to them by the King. It is quite unimportant, *in principle*, to speculate upon the probability or improbability of the King's having given that careful personal consideration to the actual particulars of the revision, which he first said he *would* give, and which he afterwards said he *had* given. He probably, in fact, gave as much attention to this matter, as he did to any other serious matters of business, and, indeed, rather more: for there are frequent evidences of the struggle, in his

own mind, between his sense of the promises he had made, and his conviction that he was breaking them.

It will, probably, be asked: Did the two Convocations, or either of them, in 1661, bring forward a claim of right to revise the Prayer Book, if any revision of it was to be made, or to approve of the revision, as a condition precedent to its being submitted to Parliament?

There is no evidence of any such claim having been made by either. The evidence is all the other way.

Thirteen bishops accepted seats at the Savoy Conference, including one who sat on the Presbyterian side, Bishop Reynolds, of Norwich, who had been, until lately, himself a Presbyterian.[1]

The Savoy Conference was a Royal Commission for the revision of the Prayer Book by Episcopalians and Presbyterians jointly, without any intention of a subsequent revision.

On the Episcopalian side of the Conference were twelve bishops, of whom eight belonged to the Province of Canterbury, and four to the Province of York, *being, in fact, the whole of the Upper House of York,* for that Province had then four bishops only, including the archbishop [besides Sodor and Man, which must have been then vacant. Compare Le Neve's "Fasti" with Sir H. Nicolas]. These twelve bishops were assisted by nine Episcopalian clergymen, who were also members of the Savoy Commission itself, making twenty-one Commissioners on the Episcopalian side. On the Presbyterian side there was the like number of twenty-one Commissioners, of whom twelve were more important than the other nine; and one of the twelve was Bishop Reynolds, who had been a Presbyterian. We see, by *the Preamble to the Act of Uniformity,* already quoted, that the powers of the Savoy Conference were practically the same as those afterwards given to the two Convocations, and that, in each case, they amounted to no more than powers to "offer" or "present" suggestions to the King. It was not competent for the King to give them larger powers: for nothing but Parliament could alter or add to the nation's Prayer Book.

If the bishops who sat on the Savoy Conference had been of opinion that a revision of the Prayer Book, for the purpose of being submitted to Parliament, if approved by the King, must necessarily be made by the Convocations of the Clergy, it was their duty to refuse to act under a Commission, the express terms of which assumed the contrary; and therefore, it cannot be supposed, without doing dishonour to the memory of those bishops, that they would have acted under it.

It is true that after the Savoy Conference had proved to be

[1] See the lists in Neal's "History of the Puritans," vol. iv. p. 337. Edition of 1796.

ineffectual, and while the Prayer Book was in the course of revision by the bishops, without formal authority, the book was submitted by the King to the two Convocations, in the same terms, in effect, as the terms of the Savoy Commission, and that Lord Clarendon has told us, in his "Own Life," that "it" (meaning the *revised* book) "was necessarily to be presented to the Convocation [singular], which is the national synod of the Church;"[1] but the circumstances of the case, to be presently stated, will clearly show that this presentation was a mere after-thought, to gain time to finish the episcopal revision then in progress, and that Lord Clarendon's notion of the necessity of the presentation was an after-thought also, which occurred to his mind when he was writing his "Own Life," at a later period.

R. D. CRAIG.

(*To be continued.*)

Short Notices.

Thirty-seventh Report of the Thames Church Mission Society. 31, New Bridge Street, E.C.

WE gladly invite attention to this pamphlet, just issued—the thirty-seventh report of an excellent society. It contains an account of the proceedings at the Annual Public Meeting at Exeter Hall, April 26, 1882, the statement of the Committee, selections from the Journals of the chaplains and missionaries, a summary of the work done since 1866, with other interesting information. The "selections" are readable and instructive. Among the speakers at the Annual Meeting were the Marquis of Cholmondeley, in the chair, the Earl of Northbrook, and Henry Green, Esq. The noble Marquis said:—"The Report speaks of the loss of "friends. Two dear friends whom the Society has lost, Admiral Baillie "Hamilton and Mr. Woolloton, spoke, as some of you may remember, "at our Meeting last year. There is another to whom I would allude "for a moment—Mr. Charles Bevan. That dear friend of mine was "one of the earliest supporters of the Society, and always helped to "sustain it in times of difficulty. He was most anxious for the success "of the work, and he was always coming forward, not only with a warm "heart, but with a liberal hand, to render assistance. From what I knew "of him in private, I may say that no man could be more anxious than "he was to promote the glory of that dear Saviour whom he loved. "The loss of such a man to this Society is a very great one, but we "hope that the Lord will be pleased to raise up some one to fill his place." Mention was also made, in the Report, of Admiral Sir James Hope, K.C.B., a true and valued friend of the Society. We observe that the Committee tender their grateful thanks to the following clergymen:—

To the Rev. Richard Allen, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Gipsy Hill; the Rev. Lewis Borrett White, M.A., Rector of St. Mary Aldermary; the Rev.

[1] Vol. ii. p. 118, edition of 1827.

Richard Whittington, M.A., Rector of St. Peter-upon-Cornhill; the Rev. John Blomfield, M.A., Rector of All Saints' Church, Knightsbridge; the Hon. and Rev. R. Henley, M.A., Vicar of Putney; the Rev. Nevile Sherbrooke, Incumbent of Portman Chapel; the Rev. Sholto D. C. Douglas, M.A., Rector of All Souls' Church, Langham Place; and the Rev. Canon McConnel Hussey, D.D., Vicar of Christ Church, North Brixton, for kindly allowing the use of their pulpits for the purpose of advocating the claims of the Thames Church Mission.

The Committee, we read, "are most thankful to those kind ladies who "have so warmly taken up the labour of making Sailors' Library Bags, "and in many cases filling them with useful and interesting books, magazines, and illustrated papers." Kind gifts of thick woollen cuffs and comforters knitted by ladies ashore are in great request. Parcels of bags, books, cuffs, &c., &c., should be addressed, *carriage paid*, to the Secretary, Thames Church Mission, 31, New Bridge Street, Ludgate Circus, E.C.

The Scottish Sanctuary as it Was and as it Is. Recent Changes in the Public Worship of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland. By the Rev. ANDREW DUNCAN, Senior Minister of the United Presbyterian Congregation, Mid-Calder. Pp. 192. Edinburgh: A. Elliott, 17, Princes Street.

For those who take an interest in the wave of change which is passing over the Presbyterianism of Scotland, in regard to preaching, public prayer, and praise, and in general the worship of the "Sanctuary," will find this devout and thoughtful work a readable instructor. For ourselves, we have read the greater portion of it, and we hope, at leisure, to complete it. Whether we agree or disagree with the author, his observations at least command respect. Many of his quotations are pleasing and full of interest. He quotes THE CHURCHMAN, we observe, more than once. An anecdote about the late Principal Cunningham, reminds us of a discourse we heard him preach, some twenty years ago, in Fife; the discourse was not unworthy of that good man's reputation as a sound and learned divine; but it was, we thought, heavy and dry. The anecdote is this:—Hugh Miller said, as he left the College Church one day after hearing its minister, "Oh, that Cunningham would preach a speech! If his sermons had been like his speeches, the church would have been crammed to the door." Mr Duncan thinks that the Episcopalian custom of "presenting" the alms and oblations is not likely to find favour in Presbyterian communions; but he remarks that the thought is good. From his observations on "collections" we make a quotation:—

A Doctor of Divinity, lately deceased, once remarked that the mode of expression usually employed by ministers when proceeding to give out the first psalm from the pulpit, namely, "Let us begin the public worship of God," was not correct, for the public worship of God commenced at the door or in the lobby of the church. In saying so, he referred to the depositing by the people of their weekly offerings in the plates or basins placed for receiving them at the entrance of the sanctuary; and the remark is founded on a right view of pecuniary contribution, which, however, it is to be feared, is not always or often realized as it ought to be by the members of the church. To the Israelites it was said, with reference to their great convocations for Divine worship, "None shall appear before the Lord empty: every man shall give as he is able;" and this law was to continue in force under the Christian dispensation. In one of the Psalms, which evidently refers to the times of the Gospel, it is said, "Give unto the Lord, O ye kindreds of the people, the glory due unto His name; bring an offering, and come into His courts;" and, accordingly, as contribution of worldly substance for the support and extension of the Gospel, and the supply of the temporal wants of brethren, is one of the sacrifices or oblations expressly required from Christians, so it is mentioned, by the name of "the fellowship," as a stated part of the ordinary worship of the church at Jerusalem; and the

same view of it is given in the apostolic order to some of the churches of the Gentiles "concerning the collection for the saints" in Judea (1 Cor. xvi. 2), "the first day of the week" being specified as the proper time for making the collection, because it was the season of their regular assembling of themselves together for the worship of God. Christians are thus taught to regard their contributions as acts of religious service. But the members of our churches are apt to forget this when observing the usual mode in which their contributions are given. This may be said to have come down to us from the Old Testament times (2 Kings xii.; Luke xxi. 1–4). It is not, however, universally practised. In some Presbyterian congregations in Scotland, the mode observed in the English Church is followed. The collection is taken after the sermon, or immediately before the benediction, by means of *ladles*, or small wooden basins or boxes, which, having long handles attached to them, are thereby passed along before the worshippers in their several pews. This mode, while it possesses the advantage of direct application being made to each individual,[1] is also more in conformity with the principle of contribution being, as truly as praise or prayer, a religious observance.

Voices from the Lakes, and other Poems. By the Rev. C. D. Bell, D.D. Nisbet.

This is a new edition of Canon Bell's poems, which we have much pleasure in commending to our readers. It is not given to every poet to live amid such poetical surroundings as our author has enjoyed. His brother bards might almost envy Canon Bell his lifelong familiarity with Rydal and Ambleside and the thousand charms of Wordsworth's country. In this volume he shows how he could appreciate such classic ground. The very spirit of the region breathes in his graceful blank verse poems of "Wilfred Ray" and "Ellen." It may be mentioned that Longfellow did Canon Bell the honour of inserting some of his pieces in his "Poems on Places." There is also an interesting note attached to one of the poems in "Voices of the Lakes," called "Dying Words," referring to Lady Augusta Stanley's desire—"When I am dead, think of me as in the next room; only one is to the back and the other to the front." Dean Stanley informed the author that "The poem faithfully expressed the spirit of those last words and last days." The commendation of two such men as Longfellow and Dean Stanley is alone sufficient to prove the high merit of this volume, which contains poems on a great variety of subjects all marked by the true love of Nature and the cheering light of Evangelical truth.

There are one or two sonnets on St. Mary's Church, Ambleside, which are particularly pleasing, and the longer poem, "The Dream of Pilate's Wife," may be mentioned as a good example of Canon Bell's power of imagination and expression.

The Epistle to the Hebrews. With Introduction and Notes by A. B. Davidson, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, &c., in the New College, Edinburgh. Pp. 254. T and T. Clark.

This is one of the series of Messrs. Clark's "Handbooks for Bible Classes," and it is a good specimen. Dr. Davidson's Notes, so far as we have examined, are sound and scholarly.

Hymns for the Church Catholic. Pp. 510. Hodder and Stoughton.

This new Hymn Book is compiled and edited, as we learn from a prefatory note, by the Rev. J. B. Whiting, the well-known Vicar of St.

[1] This, however, may be thought liable to an objection, which is stated by Vinet, in his "Pastoral Theology," part iii. sect. 1. "It will be well for the pastor," he says, "not to allow the plate to circulate. The sound is uncongenial, and *it may force people to give.* It would be better to place some receptacle at each door."

Luke's, Ramsgate. The collection seems to us a really good one; we find a large number of the best hymns; and out of the 510 hymns which the book contains, there are few which are poor or unsuitable. The arrangement has been made, to a great extent, according to the Church's year and the language of the Prayer Book: Advent, Epiphany (with Missions), Lent, Easter, Ascension Day, Whitsuntide, and Trinity; afterwards Grace, Love, and Fellowship, Creation and Preservation, Blessings of this Life (with Harvest), Redemption, the Means of Grace, the Hope of Glory; then—

Praise.
Service.
Holiness and Righteousness.
The Christian Life.
Faith and Love.
The Holy Catholic Church.
The Communion of Saints.
The Forgiveness of Sins.
Death and the Resurrection.
The Life Everlasting.

As to the way in which the hymns in any selection are arranged, there will inevitably be differences of opinion. We have before us only a cheap edition of "Hymns for the Church Catholic," and it contains no allusion to alterations or additions which have been made in the case of certain hymns. We cannot say we like the new verse of S. F. Adams' "Nearer, my God, to Thee," which runs thus:—

And when my Lord again
Glorious shall come,
Mine be a dwelling-place
In Thy bright home,
There evermore to be
Nearer, my God, to Thee.

The fifth verse of the original hymn, "Or if on joyful wing," has been omitted. The tone of a selection made by Mr. Whiting, we need scarcely say, is deeply devout, while the precious truths concerning Christ's Gospel are clearly and fully set forth.

The Parallel New Testament. Cambridge Warehouse, 17, Paternoster Row, 1882.

This volume contains, in parallel columns, the two English Versions, 1611 and 1881. The left hand column contains the Authorized Version with its marginal notes, and this version has been reproduced substantially as it was first given to the public; a few changes have been made. The right hand column contains the Revised Version with its marginal notes. The Revisers' Preface and the American readings and renderings are given.

With regard to type and paper this well bound volume is delightful.

The changes which have been made with the "Parallel New Testament" in hand are seen at a glance. Some readers will mark the multitude of changes, great and small, with a feeling akin to anger or dismay; others, again, will patiently compare passage with passage, and inquire what reason may be alleged for this or that alteration, while at the same time they note with satisfaction the many undeniable improvements. With a very large proportion of students, probably, the conclusion arrived at will be that the revision, if judiciously revised, may be accepted as the Victorian Version with almost universal approbation. The question of readings, with many, is even more important than that of renderings; and the debate about the Greek text is of itself

enough to prevent the Revised Version from becoming an "authorized" Version. But all devout and thoughtful readers no doubt will regard this "Parallel New Testament" as supplying valuable material for study among the laity as well as among the teachers and pastors of the English-speaking world. For ourselves, having studied carefully, and as we think impartially, the great proportion of the various criticisms on the Revised Version which have appeared, we must confess we see no reason to be dissatisfied with the opinions which we expressed in the four numbers of the CHURCHMAN which followed the publication of the work.

The Religious Topography of England. By S. R. PATTISON. The Religious Tract Society.

This work, so far as it goes, is good. One might well, of course, give many more places and add a little to the biographical sketches; but then the book, now of a convenient size, would be both bigger and dearer. Baxter, we were told in the hamlet of Rowton, was born there, in the parish of High-Ercall; but it is quite true that he spent his childhood in the parish of Eaton Constantine.

At ye Grene Griffin. A Tale of the 15th Century. By EMILY SARAH HOLT. J. F. Shaw & Co.

We always gladly welcome a new story by Miss Holt. Such a series as her "Tales of English Life in the Olden Time" deserves to be known even better than it is. The present work, "At ye Grene Griffin; or, Mrs. Treadwell's Cook," though somewhat slight, is not unworthy of "Joyce Morell's Harvest," "Earl Hubert's Daughter," and other admirable tales. In a merely literary aspect it deserves no small praise; but in the best of all senses the book is really excellent and profitable. The Lady Anne and poor Mrs. Treadwell are sketched with skill.

Electric Lighting. Translated from the French, by ROBERT ROUTLEDGE, B.Sc. (Lond.), F.C.S., author of "A Popular History of Science," &c., with seventy-six illustrations, pp. 318. G. Routledge & Sons, 1882.

This book is a translation of the second edition of the Comte du Moncel's *L'Eclairage Electrique*, published at Paris in 1880. Those who are interested in this subject will find the translation very readable, and the illustrations are a great help.

Canon LIDDON has published the sermon, *The Recovery of St. Thomas* (Rivingtons), which he preached in St. Paul's three days after the death of Mr. Darwin. He has added a prefatory note, and this many will read with interest; it contains the most striking passages from Mr. Darwin's writings with reference to belief in God. We cannot regard some passages quoted, together with Canon Liddon's apologetic comments upon them, as at all satisfactory. For example. If it should be granted, *a.g.*, that "the first man had for his mother an anthropomorphous ape" (to quote Dr. Liddon), if it should be granted again, with regard to the words of Holy Scripture, "the Lord God formed man . . . . that this *formation* was not a momentary act, but a process of development continued through a long series of ages" (again to quote Dr. Liddon), surely we make new difficulties. If the *formation* of Adam was "a process of development," what are we to say about the "making a help-meet for" Adam? Had Eve for her mother "an anthropomorphous ape?" Some of Canon Liddon's remarks we have read with regret. We quote an interesting passage:—

"It is right to make an observation for the sake of those persons who "may not have read Mr. Darwin for themselves, namely, that his books

"show him to have been a believer in Almighty God. To go no further "than 'The Descent of Man'—the work which has perhaps on the whole "occasioned the largest amount of anxiety and misgiving—he there twice "speaks of belief in God, as 'ennobling.'[1] No serious writer would so "speak of any belief, much less of the tremendous 'belief in the existence "of an Omnipotent God,'[2] unless he himself held it to be a true belief. "No superstition ever did or could 'ennoble' the man who held it; and "when Mr. Darwin says that the question, 'whether there exists a "Creator and Ruler of the universe,' has been answered in the affirma-"tive by the highest intellects that have ever lived,[3] he at least implies "that he does not dissent from their judgment.

"That Mr. Darwin's doctrine of the origin of species by natural "selection is not of itself opposed to faith in God's relation to the "material universe as its Maker and ever-present Upholder and Ruler, "need not be insisted on. Mr. Darwin has taught many readers how to "think of God working in Nature during long periods of time, not how "to think of Nature as excluding God. On this subject Dr. Pusey has "written, with the high authority which always belongs to him:—

> The question as to "species," of what variations the animal world is capable, whether the species be more or fewer, whether accidental variations may become hereditary, whether the "struggle for existence" may have occasioned animals which once existed to disappear, whether, *e.g.*, the animals ranged under the tribe of *felis* or *canis* were each originally variations of some common progenitor, and the like, naturally fall under the province of science. In all these questions Mr. Darwin's careful observations gained for him a deserved approbation and confidence. These questions have no bearing whatever upon Theology.[4]

"And he quotes, with approbation, Professor Reusch, of Bonn, as "saying:—

> A relationship of race between more nearly related types of the animal and vegetable kingdom, even when one extends this relationship very far, has theologically nothing about it which we need apprehend.[5]

"It must, however, be admitted that in his work on the 'Descent of "Man,' Mr. Darwin does something towards inviting a modification of "this judgment by such a passage as the following:—

> If I have erred in giving to Natural Selection great power, which I am very far from admitting, or in having exaggerated its power, which is in itself probable, I have at least, as I hope, done good service in aiding to overthrow the dogma of separate creations.[6]

We quote two other sentences.

"Certainly an injustice is done to Mr. Darwin," says Dr. Liddon, further on, "if his mind is interpreted by the crude and consistent "Atheism of Haeckel and other writers, who make the very assumption "which Mr. Darwin's belief in God led him to reject. It is impossible "not to wish that he had vigorously repudiated an unbelief which claimed "to understand him better than he understood himself."

Dr. GEIKIE has sent forth another volume of his *Hours with the Bible* (Hodder & Stoughton), a valuable work, displaying the highest literary

---

[1] "Descent of Man," vol. i. pp. 65, 106.
[2] Ibid., p. 106. [3] Ibid., p. 65.
[4] "Unscience, not Science, adverse to Faith," by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., 1878, 2nd edition, p. 52, notes.
[5] "Bibel und Natur," p. 373, qu. by Dr. Pusey, ubi sup., p. 52.
[6] "Descent of Man," qu. by Dr. Pusey, "Unscience," &c., p. 54, 2nd edition.

and theological excellence. In his preface he writes strongly concerning the tone and style of Dr. Robertson Smith's unhappy book. He says :—

"It was inevitable that a controversy respecting the origin and struc-
"ture of the Pentateuch should one day arise; but that it should have
"been opened by a gentleman of such ultra opinions as Dr. Smith is a
"misfortune. . . . . Years and wider study will teach Dr. Smith to be
"less confident and contemptuous.

"He tells us repeatedly that 'there is no doubt,' that 'it is quite certain,'
"that 'the plain fact is,' that 'the conclusion is inevitable,' when he gives
"forth an opinion. No faintest perfume of modesty flavours his super-
"ciliousness. His Sir Oracle tone never leaves him. The world must
"accept him as a Daniel come to judgment. No dog of a 'traditionalist'
"must bark when he opes his mouth.

"It is nevertheless beyond question that his theory of the origin of the
"middle books of the Pentateuch after the Exile, is rejected by all but
"the Jacobins of Biblical criticism. He has simply adopted the teaching
"of the school of Kuenen and Wellhausen, who in this follow Graf,
"George, and Vatke. There is no tincture of originality in any single
"page of his book. He forgets to tell the audiences who listened to his
"lectures that his theory as to Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, was
"opposed to those of De Wette, Ewald, Von Lengerke, Knobel, Bleek,
"Dillmann, Riehm, Kleinert and others, compared with whom Kuenen
"and Wellhausen are very minute authorities indeed."

The Rev. NORMAN L. WALKER'S *Scottish Church History* (T. & T. Clark) is a well-written little volume, and it contains—in a compact form—a good deal of interesting information. Mr. Walker is a staunch Presbyterian; but he strives to be historically impartial and accurate. Many of his Scottish readers who are loyal to the Presbyterian Establishment will question some of his remarks. Stating that the United Presbyterian Church has "nearly 180,000 communicants," and the Free Church "about 300,000," he adds that the claims of the Established Church to have "over 500,000" is a mistake, "an over-estimate." Episcopacy, he says, has gathered strength and is "growingly influential." He rightly remarks that "the whole constitutional framework of Presbyterianism is democratic." Herein, to a great extent, has been the strength of the Kirk. While high views are held of "the Church" as a Divine institution, high views have also been held of the position occupied by each individual member. The Church of England, we have always felt, is not "democratic" enough.

From Messrs. Seeley & Co. we have received *Augustine* and *Chrysostom*, two volumes of a new series entitled "Church Lamps." On the title-page appears the Revised Version rendering of St. John, v. 36, "The lamp that burneth and shineth." Such a series as "Church Lamps," "thoughts on divine things" selected from the greatest writers, many will warmly welcome. But, in regard to the Sacraments, the selections seem to us not all judicious. Nor do we like the foot-note (*Chrysostom*, p. 34) about Monasticism; such passages about what Ritualists and Romanists term "the Religious life" should not—in so small a book—have been quoted. The tiny volumes are tastefully got up.

Another volume of the "Cambridge Bible for Schools" series, *Micah, with Notes and Introduction*, has been published (Cambridge Warehouse, 17, Paternoster Row), the work of Mr. CHEYNE, late Lecturer of Balliol, now Rector of Tendring, Essex. The work is not unworthy of such a scholar. Here and there, in regard to prophecy, we should have been thankful to see—in a book "*for Schools*"—a firmer tone, and more guarded language.

Messrs. Routledge are publishing in their cheap and useful "Sixpenny Series" *Sir John Gilbert's Illustrated Shakespeare.* We have received parts ii. and iii.

In the *Quiver* (Cassell) appears an interesting article on Bristol as "a city of charities." *Little Folks* is charming as usual; the June number completes the volume, and fortunate will be the children who obtain it. To the *Sunday Home* the Rev. C. H. Adams contributes a paper on "Good King Robert."

From Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton we have received four charming little volumes, *The Coming of the Bridegroom,* and *The State of the Blessed Dead,* by DEAN ALFORD; *Who is He? or the Anxious Inquirer Answered,* by SARAH F. SMILEY; and *Friendship with God,* by Dr. STANFORD.

A good little book is Dr. SYMINGTON'S *Life and Ministry of John the Baptist.* (R. T. S.) The language is sometimes rather "flowery" (as, *e.g.,* when in saying that the damsel asked for the head in a charger, Dr. Symington says, "She simpered it"); but there is thought, earnestness, and power.

Old England (S. P. C. K.): a lecture by Bishop HARVEY GOODWIN, is a very interesting pamphlet. Pp. 48.

The fourth volume of "Talks with the People by Men of Mark" (*Home Words* Publishing Office), a capital series, is *Sir Wilfrid Lawson;* extracts from the Temperance speeches of the "hon. and amusing baronet."

The Queen has been graciously pleased to accept a copy of Mr. Mackeson's "Year Book of the Church."

We have received Part XXIX. of *Letts's Popular Atlas* (Letts & Co., 33, King William Street); the maps are excellent, and cheap.

On the Ecclesiastical Courts. By Canon TREVOR.

In the April CHURCHMAN we ventured to make some comments on this pamphlet. Apparently our review posssesed some occult power to offend, which we had not detected; for although it occupied but a subordinate position in these pages, it excited heavy indignation in the *John Bull,* a journal which usually exhibits a nervously jealous regard for the reputation of Canon Trevor. Nor was the Canon content with the defence of the *John Bull.* In the June CHURCHMAN he delivers himself on our review. He is anxious that we should know the responsibility we have incurred by criticizing a pamphlet which, besides having been written by himself, has with regard to "its two leading suggestions," received the approval of the Lower House of York Convocation, has occasioned the writer to be examined before the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, and has furnished materials for correspondence in the *John Bull, Guardian, Record,* and "even the *Nonconformist.*" We have no defence to offer. For good or for ill we have committed ourselves to this audacious course, and we must make what stand we can against the attack which we have provoked. The learned doctor's guns are soon placed, but before opening fire he pays us a compliment on our manners. We have been ignorant, misled, foolishly blind; but, at any rate, we have been polite. Our satisfaction at having pleased Canon Trevor, in even so small a matter as this, is, however, a good deal mitigated by the surprise which it has excited in both our critics. Canon Trevor is "thankful," and *John Bull* is "glad"—both pleasant emotions; but why they should be simul-

taneously aroused by conduct which we trust is only our wont, we do not understand.

Canon Trevor's critique on our critique deals with three points—(1) our mistakes; (2) his suggestion to extend the jurisdiction of the bishops by a new canon; and (3) his proposed reform of the Final Court of Appeal.

As to the first he has given us very little to reply to. We have not even the consolation of confessing our faults. He anticipates the discovery by the candid reader of a "portentous mass of historical mistakes" in our review; but he does not point them out, and in truth the severity of Canon Trevor's judgment has apparently been increased by a mistaken impression that we had made a similar charge against him, which he thus meets, perhaps, more simply than effectually by a *tu quoque*. There is, indeed, one proposition of ours which causes our critic great discomfort. He describes it as "undisguised Erastianism," and appears extremely shocked that we could entertain such notions. We are, of course, indifferent judges of the thoughts and imaginations of Canon Trevor, but we are disposed to think that both in his horror at the idea of the State controlling the discipline of the Church, and in his repudiation of any "compact" between Church and State, he is the victim of his own misapprehension. We suspect Canon Trevor has not sufficiently considered the distinction between discipline and doctrine. It is the former that we maintained, and with deference to our learned critic, still maintain, is in the hands of the State; that is, the *maintenance* of the doctrines and ceremonies of the Church amongst its members, an obviously different matter to the *settlement* of those doctrines and ceremonies. This distinction between doctrine and discipline, between the making and the working of rules, between legislation and administration, is the key to our Church History ever since the Reformation. When it is grasped, facts, which otherwise seem contradictory, fall into their proper places, and the whole assumes a consistency and even symmetry which, if we neglect this consideration, are altogether absent. From this principle it follows that the Courts which carry out the discipline of the Church are tribunals owing their authority wholly and entirely to the State: hence they are called the King's Ecclesiastical Courts. Erastianism is a vague word, which has been so indiscriminately employed by a certain class of controversialists to stigmatize tenets utterly diverse in their nature, that it has lost its terrors.[1] We confess that we care not a straw for Canon Trevor's wordy anathema, so long as we feel our feet resting on the sober foundation of historical fact, which no tremendous adjective will ever shake. Canon Trevor challenges us to produce any canon, or statute, or standard writer, in favour of the proposition that the "power and jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical court are derived from the State," and without awaiting a reply, declares that none exists.

A complete answer to this question can only be given in an examination, of some minuteness, into the history and legislation of the last three centuries. But we do not desire to shirk the learned Canon's challenge, and in accepting it, we choose a statute, because, on the one hand, we do not think quite so much of canons as our critic, and because, on the other, the authority of a "standard writer," is always more or less, a matter of opinion. But we refer Canon Trevor to the preamble of 37 Henry VIII. ch. 17, a Reformation Statute, later in date, and therefore, if inconsistent, repealing the Statute of Appeals, and its supposed declarations of ecclesiastical independence, a Statute, moreover,

[1] We may venture, with the Editor's permission, to remind the readers of THE CHURCHMAN of Canon Saumarez Smith's papers on this subject (vol. iv.), which at the time we noticed were commended in the *Guardian*.

dealing with this very matter of the status of Church judges, or to quote Canon Trevor, "incontestably established for this purpose at the Reformation." The Papal Law had been abolished for some years, yet the Bishops, clinging to the traditions of the past, would only appoint celibates and clerics as their chancellors and judges. This Statute therefore was passed, by the State (be it remembered) to remedy the evil. What does it say? It recites that "Albeit the said decrees, ordinances, "and constitutions . . . . be utterly abolished . . . . yet because the "contrary thereunto, is not used, nor put in practice, by the Archbishops, "Bishops, Archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, *who have no "manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by, under, and from your "Royal Majesty.*" . . . . Now it will not do for Canon Trevor to tell us that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction here spoken of is in contradistinction to "spiritual authority," for the Statute goes on to say that to the King is committed, "by Holy Scripture, all *authority* and power to hear and determine all manner of causes ecclesiastical," and further enacts that any lay-man (D.C.L.), although married, may yet be appointed Chancellor, Vicar-General, &c., and may lawfully execute and exercise all manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, "and *all censures* and coercions, appertaining to the same." In other words, such a judge may deliver what Canon Trevor calls the "purely spiritual" sentences of suspension and excommunication, technically called censures. We find, therefore, in the Reformation Statutes, on which Canon Trevor takes his stand, the very same "undisguised Erastianism" of which we are accused. We do not pretend that this discovery vindicates our orthodoxy, but at any rate it answers with sufficient completeness our learned critic's confident challenge.

With regard to the expression "*compact* of Establishment," which we are told is imaginary, we admit the charge to a certain extent. No doubt this compact, as a matter of history, is imaginary, as completely as is the "Reformation *settlement*" of which Canon Trevor speaks so much. Both words imply a definite transaction which never occurred. Still, as a matter of convenience, we take leave to use both. All we mean by "compact" is that by a series of events the Church and State came to be in a certain relation towards one another, similar in many respects to that which might exist between two corporations as the result of mutual agreement. There are considerations moving to and from both sides, and there are duties and obligations on both sides. This relation with its conditions, we call, we venture to think, harmlessly, a compact. The principle is much the same as that known to the law as "Lost Grant." When individuals and their predecessors in title have for a certain length of time occupied a certain relation to one another, with regard to property, the law assumes this state of things to have originated in a deed of grant which has been lost, although no one concerned has the smallest belief that such a deed ever existed, nay, even although it is demonstrable that it never did exist.

We proceed to consider the other two points upon which Canon Trevor replies to our review. These are his own two suggested reforms. We endeavoured to deal with these suggestions, and we pointed out what seemed to us grave objections to their adoption. We have now re-read the Canon's pamphlet, and further consideration, with the aid of the author's own commentary, has not increased our respect for it. We give Canon Trevor credit for the best intentions; we warmly sympathize in his desire to see Church troubles appeased without sacrifice of those principles which ever since the Reformation have influenced our ecclesiastical history. But we repeat our conviction that what is proposed to be done is very ill-adapted to give effect to these good wishes, while the proposed manner of doing it is entirely unsound and dangerous.

Canon Trevor's first proposal is, that before any ecclesiastical litiga-

tion against a clergyman is permitted by the Bishop, he is to summon the parties before him personally, and with the aid of a Board of Assessors, to hear and endeavour to settle the dispute. This new process is to be enacted, not by Statute, but by a Canon of Convocation; and the clergyman, if he acquiesces in the decision, is to be exempted from consequences which his conduct might otherwise entail. Canon Trevor lays great stress upon two things—(1) he wants his new "canonical inquiry" to rest on Canon not on Statute, and (2) it is not to be a legal process. Surely its mere statement is enough to condemn this scheme.

There was once an Italian who invented and constructed an air-gun after a perfectly new pattern. It was quite unlike any other gun, and its conception displayed remarkable ingenuity, but the inventor forgot to provide a vent for the compressed air, the release of which furnished the propelling power. The consequence was that every engineer who examined the gun foresaw that if let off it must inevitably burst at a particular point. It is nearly two hundred years since that gun was made, but to this day no one has been found willing to pull its trigger—not even the inventor—and the weapon remains stored up in a museum in London, a monument of the ingenuity and the unpracticalness of the maker. Canon Trevor's new tribunal which is not a court of justice, and his new process which is not a lawsuit, strongly resemble the Italian's air-gun, except that if attempted to be used, the Canon's invention will give way, not at one, but at every point. Surely the collection of canonical curiosities is sufficiently large and varied without our presenting posterity with what would no doubt be a unique addition. The failure of Canon Trevor's device is certain, because he is attempting to combine in one scheme features absolutely contradictory. We do not desire to repeat what we said in our former review, but if our readers will refer to it they will see that we are far from undervaluing the private and fatherly counsel which it is no less the right of the Bishop to give, than the duty of his clergy to listen to. But what we object to is the attempt to combine the advantages of this private counsel with the binding effect of a formal legal sentence. It is admitted that the law as it stands recognizes the domestic jurisdiction of the Bishop, but this, it is urged, is of no use, because the Church cannot allow its Bishops to receive spiritual authority from an Act of Parliament. We must have a Canon therefore. Now we cannot suppose Canon Trevor is altogether ignorant of the singular position which Canons of Convocation occupy in our legal system. They do not bind the laity at all, they only affect the clergy to a limited degree, and if they are contrary to the Statute or Common Law, they are absolutely null and void. Will our readers picture for themselves the sea of confusion into which Canon Trevor proposes to steer the already tempest-tossed vessel of our Church? Imagine the parishioners of a semi-Romish clergyman, who have lodged a complaint, being summoned to appear before the friendly and canonical Board. They would almost certainly decline to recognize the Canon, and would appeal to the Bishop, as a judge charged with the administration of the Queen's ecclesiastical laws, to grant them justice. In so doing they would act within their undoubted rights. How would the Board act? If they persevered in their "friendly" arbitration *ex parte*, and against the will of the complainants, the whole affair would be a ridiculous and scandalous farce, and if they did not, and the suit proceeded in the Ecclesiastical Court, the clergyman would have some title to complain of a conflict between the Canon Law which he acknowledged, and the Statute law which he rejected.

Again, a clergyman who has been counselled in a "fatherly and brotherly" manner, according to the Canon, is to be protected against further attack. But how? His parishioners decline to be bound by the Canon,

and the clergyman will find it vain to plead its authority before the Judge, unless it has been ratified by Statute. We had gathered from certain "suggestions for a new Bill" appended to the pamphlet, that the sanction of the Legislature was to be procured; but this, it seems, is a mistake, for we are now told that the Legislature's sanction is one of the two drawbacks which have prevented the successful exercise of the Bishop's domestic jurisdiction under the present system. Here Dr. Trevor seems to lose himself in the confusion he has created. The authority of the new process is to rest solely on Canon, yet it is to have the "legal effect" of "protecting "those who obey the Bishop's monition from the penalties of the law." Moreover, the second main cause of failure at present is "that no sufficient "provision exists for securing obedience to the domestic authority." Canon Trevor must be much less familiar with history than we believe him to be if he does not know that nothing but an Act of Parliament will give the "protection" and "security" he requires, yet he himself admits that if "enacted by Statute Law the reference to the Bishop"would be useless, because only "another stage in the litigation," and, we will take leave to add, another step in a litigation which already has much too many. Here we must leave the "friendly" arbitration scheme in the state of entanglement which we indicated in our former notice, and from which its inventor has in no degree rescued it by his recent letter.

Canon Trevor's second great reform is of the Court of Final Appeal. He desires to see the Upper House of Convocation installed as a sort of Court of Reference in questions of doctrine, and he strives to show that his suggestion is in accordance with the constitutional position of Convocation in time past. In our former review we warned the learned Canon to be careful about his "Court of Convocation." Disregarding our caution, however, and assuring us that we have been "misled by some modern judicial *dicta*" (we are absolutely in the dark as to these *dicta*: our only reference was to a well-known textbook) the eager doctor has plunged forward, and with very surprising results. The extraordinary use he makes of statutes, old and new, of historical facts, and, we must add, fictions, and the wonderful way in which the smallest reference to Convocation, whether really in his favour or not, is swept into his argument, are, so far as we know, without parallel in historical controversy. If audacity of statement could settle a discussion, Canon Trevor's dogmatism would certainly mark the close of this one. Take, for instance, the following sentence: "Before and *after* the Reformation the greater "part of the questions now brought into the Ecclesiastical Courts with "regard to ritual and doctrine were disposed of by the Ordinaries and "*Synods*." In the pamphlet we find the same thing asserted. "These "(questions of doctrine and ritual) were dealt with either in Convocation— "the Supreme Court in questions of heresy after the suppression of the "Papacy—or by the Ordinaries at their visitations, or by the Ecclesiastical "Commissions," &c. But when we turn to the facts, we find that no single case is recorded of any dispute either of doctrine or ritual having been determined by Convocation since the Reformation, and this is admitted by Canon Trevor. "No cases of appeal from the Archbishop's "Court to Convocation are found upon record since the Statute" (of Appeals). We confess to a feeling of despair in arguing with an antagonist who thus allows absolutely baseless assertion to stand in the place of historical evidence.

The most serious mistake into which Canon Trevor has been led is owing to the unaccountable manner in which he construes the Statute of Appeals (24 Henry VIII. ch. 12). That Act provided that no appeal in certain named matters should thereafter be carried to Rome, but that all such suits should be finally decided in the Archbishop's Court. The Act further provided that in a cause "touching the King," with regard

to any of the named matters, an appeal should lie to the Upper House of Convocation. Canon Trevor's inference from this enactment is, that there was, *before the date of the Statute*, an appeal to the Bishops in Convocation, so that the Act merely re-asserted the jurisdiction! It would be equally logical to infer from the language of the Coercion Act of last year a pre-existing power in the Government to imprison suspected persons without trial. The truth is, that the attempt to bolster up the "Court of Convocation" by reference to the Statute of Appeals is a simple blunder. This Statute erected one House of Convocation into a Court, in certain special matters, where the King was personally interested in the litigation. Whether that enactment is still in force or not may be an open question (the judges have decided that it is not), but it is absolutely irrelevant to the present inquiry. The case that is made in favour of the jurisdiction of Convocation is quite different. It is this: Prior to the Reformation persons accused of heresy were undoubtedly sometimes examined before the Archbishop in Synod (*i.e.*, both Houses), and it is said that that jurisdiction has never been taken away. On the other hand, it is argued that we know too little of the nature of this authority and the manner of its exercise to make it possible to invoke it now; that as a matter of fact it never has been invoked since the Reformation; that the Reformation Statutes, providing as they do a complete system of church judicature, in which this jurisdiction is not even referred to, have abolished it. In Queen Anne's reign the judges were divided in opinion, a majority being in favour of the jurisdiction; but we have every reason to believe that political reasons influenced the opinions then expressed; at any rate, modern authorities are almost unanimous against the supposed jurisdiction, and if Canon Trevor wants us to believe in his "Court of Convocation," he must accumulate a far more formidable array of evidence than he seems at present able to produce. He says indeed that he has shown the mysterious "modern judicial *dicta*" to which he refers, to be "against all established law down to the reign of Queen Anne," but having consulted both pamphlet and appendix, we fail to perceive where this feat is accomplished, and so both the "misleading *dicta*" and their refutation remain shrouded in mystery.

There only remains for us to deal with Canon Trevor's assurance that instead of "attacking the Judicial Committee (as the reviewer imagines), "I do not propose to touch it in any way as originally constituted." His plan is that the Archbishop's Official Principal and the Upper House of Convocation should settle disputes of doctrine and ritual between them, and that only in the event of a miscarriage of justice should there be an appeal to the Privy Council. Naturally, therefore, Canon Trevor does not see any need to make changes in the latter. He simply proposes to "Boycott" it, to leave it high and dry on the shelf, without the opportunity of exercising the functions for which it was framed. In denying that his proposal is revolutionary, Canon Trevor assumes, as a matter of certainty, a point which all who are acquainted with this subject know to be nothing of the sort. The Judicial Committee of Privy Council have the same jurisdiction as the old Court of Delegates, and the Statute setting up the latter allowed an appeal to it for "lack of justice" in the Archbishop's court. The meaning of these words, which custom has sanctioned for 300 years, and which Parliament and the judges have acted on for the same period, is that they make the Delegates, for all intents and purposes, the Court of Final Appeal in Church matters. On the other hand, it has been argued that the words "lack of justice" give the same sort of jurisdiction as the French appeal, "*comme d'abus*," "*tamquam abusu*," *i.e.*, an appeal when there has been some abuse of judicial power, or flagrant miscarriage of justice. Those masters of this controversy who oppose the Privy Council, such as Mr.

Gladstone, advocate this point tentatively and with due acknowledgment of all that can be said against it. Yet, throughout both his pamphlet and his letter, Canon Trevor assumes this (to say the least of it) doubtful interpretation as the true and recognized one, and no person whose knowledge of the subject was confined to what Canon Trevor is pleased to tell him, would suspect that the slightest doubt existed. We confess we feel repelled from a controversy so conducted, and we altogether fail to perceive either the wisdom or the justice of such a course. Those who already know the arguments *pro* and *con* will not be deceived, and those who do not, it should be our effort to instruct and not mislead. The truth is, that Canon Trevor's letter forms a striking illustration of the manner in which justice would be dispensed by a clerical tribunal like Convocation. With the most thorough desire to be honest and just, and with a great deal of information on the subject, Canon Trevor has yet contrived to present to us a view of well-known historical facts which is terribly one-sided and distorted. What would be the probable result if it were left to a large body of men, most of them equally biassed, but not so well informed, as Canon Trevor, to form a judgment on these facts, and then to apply it to a perhaps unpopular clergyman? We can imagine no arrangement less favourable for the display of even-handed justice. We venture to affirm that no real remedy for the present discontent will be discovered which does not leave the administration of ecclesiastical law in the hands of lawyers—ecclesiastical lawyers, we admit—but still lawyers and not clergymen.

THE MONTH.

THE condition of Ireland is a disgrace and danger to the Empire. It even waxes worse.[1] The *Record* says:—"Cardinal M'Cabe may strive to throw oil upon the troubled waters; but his efforts are scarcely seconded by such lieutenants as

[1] The *Guardian* of the 14th says:—"Nominally we are governing "Ireland by a combination of concession and coercion; practically, "there is little government at all for the greater part of the country "beyond what the Lord Lieutenant, the Chief Secretary, and the "Resident Magistrates have personal ability enough to extemporize. "That this is absolutely inadequate for the protection of the lives of "any but the criminals has again been proved by the murder of Mr. Walter "Bourke. The fact is, we have failed to do anything to check the de-"velopment of a political and social revolution which is now assuming "the most serious proportions." The killing of a landlord involved that of his armed escort also. Mr. W. Bourke, a barrister from India, who had purchased an estate in county Galway, acquired much popularity through his exertions during the failures of the harvests; but recently his dealings with his tenants had rendered him unpopular. As he was returning to his house in a gig, accompanied by a soldier for his protection, he was shot dead by five men with rifles through a loop-holed wall. As usual, no clue to the assassins has been found. Other outrages induce Colonel Brackenbury, the new official who has to deal with criminal matters, to invite the attention of the Government to the similarity of crimes over a wide area, and to its simultaneous commission.

Archbishop Croke at Cashel, and Bishop Nulty in Meath. . . . . The law is paramount only where it is supported by an adequate force of bayonets." The Prevention of Crime Bill has been debated at wearisome length in Committee; and Parliamentary progress seems effectually blocked. Mr. Dillon's defence of "Boycotting" must be considered together with Michael Davitt's Communistic address at Liverpool on "the land for the people," &c. Even the Arrears Bill has failed to satisfy the people, who quote words about governing Ireland according to "Irish ideas."

The crisis in Egypt has strengthened the power of the Sultan. The naval demonstration could only threaten Alexandria. Dervish Pasha, the Sultan's envoy, may be able to put down Arabi, and bring about peace.

Prince Bismarck sustained in the Reichstag a crushing defeat on the Tobacco Monopoly Bill; but he stated that "personal considerations for his Majesty" the Emperor would prevent him from resigning. United Germany will in nowise withdraw its confidence from the Prince.

Garibaldi has passed away.—The Panslavist General Ignatieff has ceased to be Minister of the Interior; a proof, probably, of Prince Bismarck's influence in Russia. In Turkey his influence prevails.—M. Loyson (Père Hyacinthe) has been lecturing to influential audiences in London.

The second reading of the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill was lost in the House of Lords by a majority of four: Contents, 128; Not-contents, 132. The Bill was voted for by all members of the Government except the Lord Chancellor. Sixteen Bishops, and the Archbishop of York, voted against it.

In receiving the report on the Imprisonment for Contumacy Bill, Lord Oranmore's amendment to the effect that a clergyman imprisoned for contumacy shall not be released without giving security against a repetition of the offence was rejected.

The weather has been very cold for June; and in Scotland there has been snow.

The Rev. Ernest Wilberforce, Canon of Winchester, is the Bishop designate of Newcastle. Mr. Wilberforce was for a time the incumbent of a church at Seaforth, of which Mr. Gladstone is the patron.

An influential meeting was held in London, Viscount Midleton in the chair, to consider the question of "Middle Class Education." In an admirable article on this important question the *Record* says:—

> If Evangelical truth is to hold its own in the Church of England, those who profess it must be constructive as well as destructive in their enterprises. We earnestly trust that the generous devotion which has been so conspicuous in the cause of missions, and has identified them especially with the Evangelical party, will not be want-

ing in the cause of education. There need be no fear that if the money to build and start schools is forthcoming, they will long stand empty for want of scholars.

The Annual Meeting of the Church of Ireland Sustentation Fund was held in Lambeth Palace. The Bishop of Tuam gave an interesting and effective address on "The needs of the Irish Church to enable her to maintain her witness to the truth, particularly in the present disturbed state of Ireland." The Bishop said:—

What I wish first to do in addressing you is to thank this Association for the help that Ireland has received, and more especially for the help given to my diocese. The West has been truly spoken of as a part of Ireland which deserves especial attention, because of the great extent of its parishes and the poverty of its members, and I should not like in speaking my thanks to this Society to forget that we have been nobly helped also by the City of London Association, and by that great diocese in Ireland which is full of intelligence and of business in the North, headed by its warm and noble-hearted Bishop, and which has stood by us both in famine and pestilence during the last two years in the support of the poorer parishes of our Church. These are bright spots which to us who are working in the West are full of sympathy and kindness—spots of brightness which encourage us upon our way and give us these words, "Be of good courage, brother." I do believe that the cause which is entrusted to our Irish Church—a shining and undiminished Reformation light—will not be deserted by the great Head of the Church, but that He will raise up friends for us, and that we shall be still able to maintain our position amid all the difficulties and dangers. You may depend upon this, that the Irish Church in all her difficulties is but the forerunner and the warning voice of the Church of England. My next duty is to speak to you of what my subject treats of, the necessities of the Irish Church. You are all aware of that which was alluded to in the beautiful prayer with which we opened our proceedings, and which is made manifest to us most powerfully by the daily papers—I mean the state of our country. It depends very much upon our Irish Church, and to this subject I shall venture to allude in a few sentences. You know that Ireland is a land stained with blood. You know that the voice of our brothers' blood is crying daily to God from the earth. It is a fearful state of things. I must say myself that living as I do in the west of Ireland, in what may be thought a disturbed part, I cannot tell of one unkind word, of one unkind look that has ever met me. I can go about every diocesan, every ecclesiastical business as safely and as comfortably as any of our brethren in this more favoured land.

The Rev. Edward Forbes has entered into rest. The work done by Dr. Forbes in Paris is well known; he was everywhere much esteemed.