

they have now all but disappeared, though many churches contain portions of this ancient and most appropriate furniture. I shall have to speak again of the beauty of simple open seats, when I come to shew the advantages which they possess, not less on this account, but also in the economy of room, and their superior suitability for the requirements of our Liturgy, over the wasteful and hideous boxes with which churches are now oppressed.

"We pass on now from the nave to that most essential portion of a church built in a catholic spirit—the chancel. There are two parts, and only two parts, which are absolutely essential to a church—CHANCEL and NAVE: if it have not the latter, it is at best only a chapel; if it have not the former, it is little better than a meeting-house. The 12,000 ancient churches in this land, in whatever else they differ, agree in this, that they have or had a well-defined chancel, i.e. an eastern portion expressly appropriated to the more solemn rites of our religion. In this division our ancient architecture recognized our emblem of the holy Catholic Church; as this consists of two parts, the church militant and the church triumphant, so does the earthly structure consist of two parts. It is well also to observe here, that this practice is not confined to the older churches; those which have been built since the Reformation are not deficient in this point; for instance, Leighton Bronswood, built by George Herbert; Little Gidding, by Nicholas Ferrar; and South Malling, in Sussex. The symbolical idea of a separation conveyed in this division of the chancel and nave seems always to have been clearly marked; in early times it was made by a veil or cloth stretched across, while the chancel arch in many Norman churches is richly ornamented in many instances, probably with ornaments symbolizing this distinction.

"Subsequently, the practice obtained of separating the chancel from the nave by a beautiful open screen-work, often exhibiting an endless variety of pattern. These were called cancelli, or rails, whence the term chancel. Here, before the Reformation, the rood or crucifix, and the image of the Blessed Virgin and St. John, were placed. A crucifix remains at Sherborne, in Dorset, and at Horsely, Derbyshire, where it was dug up in the churchyard, and placed over the gable of the south porch. The doors of the rood-screen represent death as the entrance from the church militant to the church triumphant; hence they open inwards, and the sculpture upon them frequently has reference to this. The lower part of the screen was often painted with figures of apostles and saints, and may now frequently be found behind pews, when the rest of the screen has been destroyed. Above the rood-screen was the rood-loft, approached either by an external turret or by stairs in the walls or piers of the building.

"It may be said that the rood-screen is a Roman innovation, and did not exist before the fourteenth or fifteenth centuries. So far from this, that we find St. Gregory of Tours describes that in the church of St. Cypprian, and one of rare beauty existed in St. Sophia, at Constantinople. Moreover, our reformers did not abolish them; many were put up in the reigns of the first James and Charles. There is one at Geddington, Northamptonshire."

After describing at length the several appendages to the chancel,—sedilia, piscina, Easter sepulchre, &c. &c.,—and illustrating this subject with a series of beautiful drawings from churches principally in Warwickshire, he concluded this part of his subject by some excellent remarks on the altar: the following is an abridgement.

"In speaking of the altar itself, we must observe, that we have now probably no single model of a high altar remaining, nor do we think it well, in our zeal for what is ancient, to advocate the restoration of the altars of stone in preference to those of wood, which were introduced at the Reformation. For practical purposes their advantages are the same, and granting that the circumstances which called for their destruction at the Reformation (viz. the connection in the minds of the common people between stone altars and the doctrine of an actual, carnal, expiatory sacrifice of the very person of our Lord in the Eucharist) have now ceased to operate, we still consider that we have the argument of appropriateness and of antiquity as strongly with us as against us, in using wood as the material of the altar. The origin of the stone altar seems to have been the necessity which existed for secret worship in the ages of persecution; this was offered frequently in the catacombs, where the tombs of martyrs and holy men presented the most ready and sacred spot on which to consecrate the Blessed Eucharist. Hence, naturally enough, arose the custom of stone altars, after the original necessity had ceased to exist. With respect to a symbolic meaning, the Romanist reasons thus: *Es lapide quia petra erat Christus*; nor can we repudiate this notion as wrong or absurd; but surely we may, with

equal force, reason that it was on the wood of the cross that the sacrifice was effected which we on the altar commemorate."

After a long and interesting description of some remains of altars, particularly to chantry chapels, he commenced the subject of painting, as follows:—

"In St. Mary's, Leicester, very beautiful paintings in ornamental patterns have been lately brought to light. This sort of ornament was not confined to large churches. I have lately learned, that in clearing the church of Teyford, in Leicestershire, a large quantity of paintings was brought to light: only one has been spared; a figure above one of the piers, holding a scroll, on which, probably, a Scripture text was written. At Radford, in Gloucestershire, the whole surface of the walls of the church was found to be covered with a legendary story told in painting, which was washed over again, as inconsistent with the proprieties of a Protestant place of worship.

"When such paintings are executed with a tolerable respect to harmony of colouring, they would give, even in their caducity, a rich but subdued tint to the walls of a church. They would, moreover, accord with those pointed windows, with which it would seem all our finest churches were filled. Seen by the modern glare of light which streams obtrusively into our churches, through the thin and disproportionate, because unstained, windows, the general details are thrown into a prominence, and invite a contrast with more finished pictures, which they will not bear. But seen, as they once were, by the dim religious light of painted windows, they must have wrought an admirable effect; giving to the sacred place that dim indefiniteness which Christian architects seem to have studied so successfully. Who is there that will not join in the lament that the glorious blazoning of our ancient fables has passed away? When we see the few shattered remains of stained glass of former days, when we contrast its deep rich colourings with the wash and weak tints of modern efforts, or with the plain glass which has succeeded, we are almost tempted to cry *Lehabod*, the glory is departed, even amid the countless beauties which yet remain.

"Thro' storied lattices no more
Is softened light the sublimous pour."

is true of far too many of our noblest churches. Against these, the frailest portion of the holy pile, the rage of ignorant zeal was most furiously directed, and many a saint which had looked for years down from the lofty windows, many a legendary tale of piety and devotion to God, many a glorious blazoning of heraldic achievement, perished beneath the hand of the destroyer. Enough, however, is left to tell us what church windows once were, to guide us in our efforts to imitate and restore. Of these we mention the windows of York Cathedral, especially the lancet windows in the north transept, known as the Five Sisters; the windows in King's College Chapel, Cambridge, and at Great Malvern in Worcestershire. There is some good glass in the window over the tapestry in St. Mary's Hall, and in the east end of St. Michael's. It is, however, only in those churches where nothing but stained glass is used that the perfect effect can be seen. Destroy but one window through which the dim come struggling through the many-coloured panes, and let in the pure white light of day, and you destroy the whole harmony and effect of the remaining lights; the contrast is too striking and unfavourable not to be observed. Nothing can exceed the beauty of a church thus wholly lighted, as at St. Neot's, in Cornwall, in the windows of which the legend of its patron saint is graphically told. Here we have casements high and triple arched—

"All garlanded with carved images
Of fruits and flowers, and bunches of knot-grass,

And diamonded with panes of quaint device,
Innumerable of stains and splendid dyes,
As are the tiger-moth's deep damask'd wings,
And in the midst among thousand heraldries,
And livelicht saints and dim emblazings,
The shielded scutebeams blust with blood of kings and queens."

"Stained glass seems to be an essential feature in later Gothic; we have seen it was introduced in compensation for the increased light, when the lancet windows were abandoned for the flowing tracery and large windows of the fourteenth century; unless, therefore, we use Norman or lancet windows, of a size appropriate to a building, we ought to have painted glass, and not only so, we must have painted glass after the ancient models. If we strive to attain pictorial effect, as in West's cartoons in St. George's Chapel, and in the beautiful chapel of Magdalen College, Oxford, we need not wonder that we fall to equal the ancient glass-stainers. The attempt to paint pictures shews a mistaken idea as to the real capabilities of the glass-painter's art. Modern stained glass should be in smaller panes, with less attempt to conceal the lead-work, and the glass

should be both thicker and coarser than it usually is; there should be less of the painter's hand, and more of a mosaic character. As those happier views of their art gain ground among glass-stainers and their customers, we shall bear fewer complaints of our inability to rival our predecessors. In this one happy method of restoring the stainer's art in our cathedrals and churches, has been suggested the proposal to supply the place of our present monuments by the insertion of painted windows in memory of the dead. This practice has been commenced in high and authoritative quarters, and we trust it will meet with many imitators."

He then entered into a very lengthy discourse on monuments, following principally the writer of the article on monumental devices, &c. in the last number of the *British Critic*, which will be too long to insert.

"But of all the evils which have gradually resulted from our neglect of the various offices of our Liturgy, and our exclusive attention to the preached word, to the neglect of the sacraments of grace—none has spread more widely, none has produced more unhappy results in the estrangement of those who separate from our communion—none calls so loudly for reform as the system of exclusion and pride which introduced and which still fosters and defends pews in our churches. It is quite impossible for me now to enter into a history of these nuisances, or to detail a length the numberless reasons which call for their abolition; one or two of these, however, I must (in vindication of the unqualified condemnation in which I speak of them) go into briefly.

"Pews are unscriptural; they keep up earthly distinctions in the very place where we are taught their unity and instrument to look forward to their abolition. They shut out the poor, who ought, if there be any difference, to be first cared for in the church, not last. 'If there come unto your assembly,' says St. James, 'a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment; and ye have respect to him that wreatheth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place, and say to the poor, Stand thou there, or sit here under my footstool, are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts?' It would almost seem as though this passage of inspiration was penned in direct anticipation of the system of pewing in our church. The rich man lays his scepterous hands upon a portion of the Lord's treebold; he fences himself off, lest he should be contaminated by the contact of his fellow-Christian; objects within the precincts of his pew the spinnars and weavers of ease and self-indulgence, and leaves to the poor a scanty strip of room in the place where all are equal. This is no exaggerated statement: there are few country churches in which it is not exemplified. Then, having once claimed as curial property that which peculiarly belongs to God, he hesitates not still further to transgress God's commands by exercising the lure of gain, and setting up the table of the money-changer in the temple of God: it is notorious that pews are bought and sold. Within the last few days I have seen a public advertisement of pews for sale in a church at Lynn. In the meantime the poor are driven from the church, where their presence is looked upon so jealously; and driven at length from her communion.

"Again, pews are evidently hostile to the spirit of our Liturgy and the voice of our church: it was not without a struggle that they first gained ground. They were strictly forbidden by many bishops and others who had authority in the church, men who were martyrs for the truth. They tend to make us forget that in the house of prayer we are all one body, and thereby offend against our belief in the communion of the saints. They prevent the congregation from seeing or being seen from the altar, towards which every worshipper ought to be turned; they encourage people to come late to church, because they know their pew will be kept for them however late they come, and they who sit in them are encouraged to many acts of irreverence of which they would not otherwise be guilty—as going to sleep, or pursuing themselves with other concerns than the service which they ought to be sharing in. Once more—and this in a utilitarian age may possibly be considered as the most cogent argument of all—pews under the most favourable circumstances, when compared with open seats, cause a loss of about thirty in every hundred, i.e. a church which without pews would hold nearly four hundred, with them, holds but three hundred. This fact may be proved by actual measurement, and it results from the great ease which open seats present for fulfilling the requirements of the rubric in the services which we render to God in the church. To kneel in a pew, we must assume either a careless posture or one most painful and difficult to maintain. The kneeling in an open sitting, is easy and natural. The back of the next seat forms a convenient rest for the arms, while for sitting, the height of the