





LIBRARY  
OF THE  
UNIVERSITY  
OF ILLINOIS





CHURCH ENLARGEMENT  
AND  
CHURCH ARRANGEMENT

“The palace is not for man but for the LORD GOD”

Published by the Cambridge Camden Society

CAMBRIDGE  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
STEVENSON CAMBRIDGE PARKER OXFORD  
RIVINGTONS LONDON  
M DCCC XLIII.  
[*Price Sixpence.*]



## CHURCH ENLARGEMENT, &c.

1. THE present Tract may, it is hoped, be useful to such Clergymen as find themselves, without any previous knowledge of church architecture, compelled, by the increase of population, to increase the size of, or at least the *room* in, their church: as well as to those who are prompted by their zeal for the honour of God's House to take steps towards its restoration to its original beauty, but who feel nevertheless that they are incompetent to direct the work without assistance. I propose first to speak of church enlargement; and then of church reparation. And if I shall be able to simplify any difficulties arising from the present real or supposed wants of congregations, and thereby to prevent any desecration of, or needless alterations in, one of God's Holy Temples, most amply shall I feel myself rewarded. The very nature of my subject may perhaps sometimes make me appear to speak in an utilitarian way, and as if churches were to be built "grudgingly or of necessity:" but they who are acquainted with the principles by which the CAMBRIDGE CAMDEN SOCIETY is actuated, and on which it was founded, will feel sure that nothing which I shall say about making the most of room, or loss of 'available space,' is intended to teach people how to make small churches hold many worshippers, or to encourage the idea that a House builded to the God of Heaven should not be "exceeding magnificent." It will also be well to observe that I am principally writing for the use of country parishes, where advice is generally of more avail, as well as less accessible.

Design of the present Tract.

Method.

Not written on utilitarian principles.

2. When it is proposed to enlarge a church on the ground of its incapacity to hold a sufficient number of parishoners, (and by a sufficient number, I mean, *under the most unfavourable circumstances, two-fifths,*) the question should first of all be asked, Is such enlargement really necessary? This enquiry need not, indeed, be instituted in a case which we shall mention presently, where the design of the founder has never yet fully been carried out: for in this case, to give the church the full proportion which he intended, will be an actual improvement to the fabrick. In other cases, since however correctly the additions may be designed, and however well executed, the proportions of the church, as a whole, must more or less suffer, the greatest

Previous enquiry necessary, whether enlargement is requisite.

care is necessary that an enlargement be not undertaken when a re-arrangement would amply suffice. This rule is of course intended to forbid all additions, which it is intended to appropriate to a particular house or family, and which sometimes make their appearance in the shape of transeptal excrescences.

Arrangement of a Church. 3. In order to answer the question, Does a given church hold as many worshippers as it ought to do,—that is, as it would hold if arranged in a catholick manner,—we must first, (though we thereby in a measure go over old ground,) say a few words on the proper arrangement of a church. And this is the more necessary because, though it is the characteristic of this economical age to make the most of every inch of ground, it is certain that few churches do contain as many worshippers as they might, and ought to, accommodate. We will take a cross church, of given size, and use it as an example.

Ejection of Pews. 4. *We assume that there are no pews in the church:* for till their ejection has been effected, a necessary loss of *twenty*, a probable loss of from *thirty* to *fifty* per cent. will be the consequence. There must be a passage down the Nave of five feet width *at least*: down each Aisle, *next to the piers*, of three feet six inches *at least*: down the middle of each Transept, of four feet *at least*. There must be a cross passage from the south-west to the north-west door, of six feet (this width is necessary for a decent performance of the Funeral service:) and along the East end of the Nave and each Aisle, of three feet. The open seats on each side should not be *higher* than two feet six inches: they *need not* be more than the same distance apart: though an intervening space of three feet will conduce much to a solemn performance of the Divine Offices. Only it must always be borne in mind that **THE HIGHER THE SEATS, THE FURTHER THEY MUST BE APART**, or the worshippers will not be able to kneel. The seats in the Nave and Aisles will of course face East: those in the North Transept, South; those in the South, North. The Chancel will have two, or if very large, may have three, rows of stalls or open seats on each side: they will extend eastward as far as the Chancel door, but generally speaking, not further: if however, the *Priest's door* be towards the western part of the Chancel, a break must be left for it in the stalling, which may then continue till within ten feet of the East wall.

Passages.

Seats.

5. One of these stalls, on the South side, next to the wall, must be a little elevated, and will be the reading-pue. The other stalls will serve for the choristers, and for the communicants during the celebration of the Holy Eucharist. The litany-stool and eagle

or lectern will stand in the middle of the Chancel: the pulpit at the North or South sides of the Chancel-arch:—the former is the better position.

6. Let us now take a church of average dimensions and arrangements, and enquire into the number of worshippers which it will contain. We will imagine one consisting of Chancel, Nave, North and South Aisles, South Porch, and disengaged Tower: that is, a Tower projecting westward of the Aisles. The Chancel we will suppose twenty-six feet in length by twenty in breadth: the Nave, fifty-one by twenty-three: the Aisles, fifty-one by nine feet six: the Tower, twelve feet six square.—Beginning with the Nave, on the South side of our middle passage of five feet, will be a space of fifty-one feet by nine:—in subtracting the cross passage of six feet, we have forty-five feet by nine. Now, allowing two feet six for the space between each seat, we have eighteen rows of benches; and allowing a breadth of eighteen inches for every sitter, each bench will hold six. The North side of the Nave will only have sixteen rows of seats, because the pulpit at its East end will take up the room of two rows. The Nave, therefore, will contain 204 worshippers. Leaving a passage of three feet six in the South side of the North Aisle, we have a space of fifty-one by six feet: this, for the same reasons as before, must be reduced to forty-five by six feet. Here we have eighteen rows, each holding four persons. The South Aisle will not contain more than fifteen such rows, because the Font will take up the room of three seats at least. Leaving a passage of three feet down the middle of the Tower, we have on each side a space of four feet six by twelve: which would afford ample room for four open seats, each containing three worshippers. The number of worshippers who would thus be provided for, would be,

In the Nave.....	204
North Aisle .....	72
South Aisle .....	60
Tower .....	24
Total.....	<u>360</u>

7. A practical difficulty would present itself *in limine* in most churches. The Western Arch would probably be blocked up: and the Tower in such a state from damp and cold as to render it impossible that any worshippers could occupy it. And it must be allowed that great care is necessary in rendering a large Tower fit for this pur-

Tower may contain worshippers.

pose; the roof must, of course, be perfectly sound, and the Belfry and western doors fitting tightly. But many Towers were in former times filled with worshippers: and there can therefore be no reason why they may not be so again.

8. We will, however, imagine that notwithstanding the substitution of open seats for puees, the throwing open of the Tower, and every other *fair* advantage which can be taken, room is still wanted. Evidently, in this case, the first step would be to raise a gallery. And it is therefore of importance to shew, at the outset, why this method of enlargement must never be thought of: why GALLERIES UNDER ANY POSSIBLE CIRCUMSTANCES ARE TOTALLY IN-ADMISSIBLE. The greater part are, of course, nothing but raised platforms of puees: and all that has been written about puees is doubly strong against these.

Galleries inadmissible, and why.

9. But we are now considering those galleries which have open free seats: and they, if not quite so bad as the other kind, are a great deal *too* bad to be for a moment endured. *Firstly*, their very position, their proud height, their seclusion, their separation from the rest of the congregation, their allurements to wandering thoughts, their theatrical appearance, are quite inconsistent with true devotion. *Secondly*, they spoil a church more than even puees: a western gallery, by concealing or blocking up that essential feature of a church, the Belfry arch; side galleries by cutting off the capitals of the piers, destroying Windows, and doing away with the beautiful effect and mystical signification of a Nave and two Aisles; and both, by involving the necessity of a lath and plaister coating in the underpart. *Thirdly*, they often loosen the walls, and weaken the piers, not only by the lateral pressure, but by causing large holes to be cut into the cores to support their timbers, and so render the building unsafe. *Fourthly*, they never were admitted into ancient churches, and are therefore an innovation: which alone is enough to condemn them. *Fifthly*, they arise entirely from an indisposition to build a sufficient number of churches, and the consequent necessity of packing too many worshippers in the same building. It is true that all these reasons do not apply to all cases, but are generally arguments against the system: and for particular cases many others might be added. For instance, sometimes they are so low and supported by such clumsy props, that they shut out those who sit below them from a view of the Priest and the Altar; besides being themselves close and unhealthy. Sometimes they are carried across the windows, necessarily obstructing some part of them, and often entirely blocking the lower part; sometimes, when used for children, the incessant moving of their feet on the hollow floor disturbs not

only the occupants of the galleries, but those who are under or near them. The system, in short, is radically bad: and therefore 'handsome Gothic panelling' in front, curiously carved legs, Tudor arches of support, and other like means which have been devised to palliate the evil, do in effect increase it, by shewing how incurable it is.

The little real increase of accommodation in them: how this is.

10. But there is another argument against them; which with some will tell more than any of the preceding. It is this: *the very trifling comparative gain of space* which they bring. Indeed it may safely be asserted that a Church, pueed and galleried, does not contain so many as it would do, if supplied with open benches instead of both. A western gallery *is generally a cause of loss of room*: as it hinders the possibility of any worshippers finding a place in the Tower. It might however seem at first sight, that a side gallery, extending over an Aisle, would of necessity hold as many as the Aisle below: but this is a very great mistake. For one passage in an *Aisle* allows every worshipper access to his seat, because the seats are disposed at right angles to the passage: but in the gallery over this Aisle, since the seats are not at right angles to, but parallel with, the main passage, there must be in addition cross-passages (in the jargon of modern church-builders, *gangways*) leading down from this main passage, between the separate rows of seats.

Gangways.

The common practice is to have such a gangway between every five seats. It cannot be well less than two feet six inches in breadth. So that for every five seats, or seven feet six, there is a loss of two feet six, *or one fourth of the whole*. Add also the room occupied by the gallery staircase, the dark corners which it renders useless, the hot corners which it renders insupportable, the room required for its supports, (if it does not rest on the piers) and other drawbacks of a similar kind: and the gain of an open gallery will be very trifling, while that of a pueed gallery will be next to nothing. It must be remembered that these remarks do not apply to those wretched proprietary chapels which are built on purpose to have galleries:—for here the staircases and other necessary appurtenances are stowed away in a "lobby," so as not to occupy "available space:" but in a church this is impossible.

Barbarous methods of enlarging a church.

11. It is to be hoped, in the present improving state of Ecclesiastical knowledge, some of the more barbarous ways of church enlargement practised by our fathers, would no longer be thought of. Since the Church Commissioners have not adopted the revised instructions of the Incorporated Society, it is necessary to speak against some of the worst ways of providing church accommodation, which are still sanctioned by their rules.

12. One is, the entire *gutting* of a church, by the removal of Piers and Pier-arches: bracing up the roof with iron, and supporting it, and the galleries, on cast iron pillars: the latter being in some cases turned to a further use, as gaspipes. And sometimes the builder has found it necessary to treat only half a church in this way: thereby leaving part of the sacred building to bear witness against his proceedings: and fearfully contrasting the old and the new methods of serving God. I could point to an instance where this has been done without even the miserable excuse of increase of room: but simply for the purpose of enabling the squire to erect a gallery, where he should be seen, and see better than would be the case when pews intervened between him and the congregation. To protest against so atrocious a system is, I would hope, almost needless.

13. Another method which cannot be too strongly reprobated is the lengthening some particular part of a church, as the Chancel eastward, or the Nave westward. That there is a proportion observed between every part of an ancient church is an unquestionable fact; we feel and know it to be so, though we cannot at present explain its rules, nor analyse its principles. This is of course entirely lost when recourse is had to the last mentioned plan.

14. In now speaking of the manner in which a church is to be enlarged, we must divide all churches into two classes: the one, where future enlargement *was*, the other where it *was not*, intended. The first will comprise those with, 1. Chancel, Nave, with or without a western Tower: 2. Chancel, Nave, one Aisle, 3. Chancel, Nave, Aisles, central Tower. The other will contain all except these.

15. Churches with Chancel and Nave afford great scope for improvement by enlargement. We have here to measure out an Aisle, on one, or on each side, making the breadth not less than a third, nor more than an half that of the Nave: and placing the new Piers in the line of the old wall. The windows, if ancient, may be removed into the Aisles: the roof of the Nave need not be touched; and the accommodation of the church will nearly be doubled. It may be better to have distinct roofs for each Aisle: though in cases where one only is added, a span-roof is very admissible: the exterior width of the Aisle being of course, very low. As a clerestory is unattainable in this kind of enlargement, the exterior should be plain and simple: pinnacles, pierced battlements, and the like, agreeing

better with a clerestoried building. Where any one Aisle is added, it should be on the South side; and there should, in all cases, be a South Porch, its position being in the Westernmost bay but one. The style of the Piers may safely be left to the Architect, with the proviso that they be not earlier than the rest of the church. Where the founder (as is sometimes the case) has left arches of construction in the wall to become the future Pier-arches, they will of course be carefully followed.

16. The case is even easier where we have *Chancel, Nave, one Aisle*: for here another Aisle may be thrown out, which may, and perhaps in most cases had better, be an exact copy of the former. But where the original Aisle had massy Norman Piers, and room is of very great consequence, the new Aisle may well have later, and therefore lighter Piers. This also may be the case where it is wished to bestow more of decoration on the addition, than a mere copy of the original would admit. It is surprising how many of such one-aisled churches exist: and how seldom has their enlargement been attempted in this most easy and natural manner.

17. *Chancel, Nave, Central Tower with or without Aisles*. Here it is plain that Transepts were designed by the founder: and Transepts, therefore, should be added, though by no means under ordinary cases, a desirable method of increasing Church accommodation.

They not only involve a serious difficulty in the method of arranging seats: but they render it excessively troublesome for the worshippers in them to take part with the rest of the congregation in Divine Worship. I have had occasion to mention this before: and if it be unadvisable to attempt Transepts, or rather what we call by courtesy Transepts, in modern churches, much more is it so in enlarging ancient ones. For here the original plan and figure of the church is entirely lost. Modern Transepts are indeed quite different things, and serve a perfectly different end from those of former times. They are used as porticoes, or rather lobbies, and have invariably an entrance at the end, which ought never to be. It is not so much their want of projection, for many fine ancient examples project little, and some not at all, beyond the Aisles: witness S. Mary, Redcliff. But their excessive breadth is one distinguishing feature: and a still more remarkable one is, *that they project from the Aisles, and not from the Nave*.

Churches not designed for enlargement.

18. We will now take the case of a church not designed by its founder for future enlargement: and examine what is to be done in this case. It must be

confessed, that the experiment is a dangerous one: and one which only the most extreme necessity would justify. Wherever it occurs, the most strenuous efforts should be made to provide an additional chapel:—A method which our ancestors would have followed, had they not rather chosen to pull down the whole church, and to build it on a new and more magnificent scale. The latter plan, to which we owe many of our finest buildings, is of course, in these days, the very last which I should recommend. And here it is proper to remember, if it be at all times a solemn thing to have to do with the building or reparation of the House of God, much more is it so, when that House is one which we have received as a rich heir-loom from our ancestors, and which we are bound to transmit, at least *as* we received it, to our posterity. In this case, the unnecessary mutilation of the building is not only an offence against HIM, but is an act of base ingratitude to them.

19. If however the dangerous experiment must be  
Enlargement by  
 addition of. tried, I will suggest one or two of the best methods of carrying it into execution. Much must depend on the particular character of the church, much on its size, and something on the nature of the ground as to which it may be best to adopt. It must always be borne in mind that nothing is more deceptive than the appearance of a proposed addition in an architect's drawing: and if implicit reliance be placed on this, great may be the disappointment, when the addition stands forth, joined indeed to the church, but not a part of it, and not only is the difference between ancient and modern work plainly perceptible, but it is evident that the latter never could have been a part of the former.

20. One method which may be adopted, is the addition of a North or South chapel, or both, to the Chancel.  
1. A North or  
 South chapel to  
 Chancel. There are many precedents for this; and three Eastern gables, if well managed, give considerable dignity to a church. Yet in this case, there ought to be a parclose, or carved screen between the Chancel and its Aisles; otherwise the former is but too likely to be made a place of common resort. This plan is peculiarly advisable in a church of considerable length, more especially in one which possesses a central Tower.

21. Another method, which may be adopted when  
2. By having  
 double Aisles  
 to the Nave. the church is of considerable length, is the addition of another North and South Aisle to the Nave. This practise, which is of perpetual occurrence abroad, does not want authority in England: and Chichester Cathedral, and Kendal church may be quoted as examples. S. Peter's at Leeds, is a modern instance. It is however attended with great difficulties, more espe-

cially as respects the roof: and may be considered the last allowable resource of church enlargers. We have, in another place, hinted that this method ought to be pursued with respect to Great S. Mary's at Cambridge.

Reverence in workmen. 22. In concluding our remarks on church enlargement, we may drop a hint on the extreme importance of instilling reverence into the mind of the workmen who may be employed therein. The Cambridge Camden Society has published a broad sheet on the subject, one or two copies of which are intended to be pasted up when a church is under repair. It has published a similar sheet for the same purpose in churches which are in progress of building. When we remember the usual course of church restoration, for instance the using the Altar for a drawing-table or workbench, this caution will not be deemed needless.

Church reparation. 23. In speaking of the repairing of a church, where enlargement is not necessary, I assume that the removal of pews and galleries is felt to be a duty: but that the clergyman wishes, in the course of the long and protracted battle which must necessarily precede so happy a victory, to set to work on some other restoration, easier in itself, and which by its evident beauty, may win men's minds to go along with him in his more startling schemes. And it is the more important to speak on this subject, because the work is so often undertaken at the wrong end.

What to begin with. I have known a large sum of money expended in tawdry painted glass, while a glorious old door, with exquisite mouldings, and a fine window with delicate tracery were allowed to go to ruin, though they might have been preserved at less expence. I have known a fine window cut away to insert in the vacancy a wretched transparency, a disgrace to any church. I have known an East window suffered to decay, while some stained deal frippery has been erected in the shape of an Altar screen. And to mention one instance by name: what but the taste of the eighteenth century would have blocked up the Altar window of S. Mary Redcliffe for the purpose of admitting that large picture of Hogarth's? In all these cases the donors, doubtless, considered themselves great benefactors to the church: and in some have considered the deed worthy of record, and have gloried in setting their names to it. To prevent such fatal mistakes, such a worse than misapplication of money, and to put a stop to less flagrant, but still crying evils of the kind, is a task well deserving our utmost labour.

Restoration of original arrangements. 24. The first thing to be done is scrupulously to restore all the original arrangements of the church, if it be possible. And by saying, *if it be possible*, I do not mean to insinuate a doubt of its being eventually in

every Clergyman's power to restore them all : if only he will set perseveringly, and fearlessly, and trustfully, and unflinchingly about it. But what I mean is this: that sometimes he must be content to wait for some of the most desirable changes, such as the removal of puees: and therefore some improvements in themselves of far less importance may fairly be undertaken first, as the means of filling up the time, and smoothing the way. Still the great object must constantly be kept in view: a puee may often be demolished here, or lowered there, a word spoken, a Tract given, against them, all tending to expedite the matter, locks may be taken off: parishioners informed that with the Churchwardens' leave they may worship in any empty, or unfilled puee: Dissenters warned that if they do not occupy (what they are pleased to call) their own puees, others will: and above all, since practice goes further than precept, the Clergyman may lose no time in destroying his own puee, and putting his family into an open seat.

25. There is, I am perfectly aware, great danger in drawing a distinction between necessary and ornamental repairs: because nothing that gives ornament to the House of God ought ever to be spoken of as unnecessary. I employ the words on the present occasion simply in a comparative sense, meaning thereby to distinguish between restorations more or less essential to the being, not more or less necessary to the well-being, of a church. A church is not as it should be, till every window is filled with stained glass, till every inch of floor is covered with encaustic tiles, till there is a Roodscreen glowing with the brightest tints and with gold, nay, if we would arrive at perfection, the roof and walls must be painted and frescoed. For it may safely be asserted that ancient churches in general were so adorned: and these decorations are the more appropriate, because they are chiefly and almost exclusively ecclesiastical. Yet because all these things are necessary to perfection, it does not follow that we may begin our restorations promiscuously with any one that we please. By commencing at the wrong end, we lay ourselves open, not to say it irreverently, to the charge: 'These things ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.' Every one would feel it an absurdity to begin the restoration of a church which had not a Font, by frescoing the walls; or laying the pavement with encaustic tiles. And is it less really absurd to present the stained glass for an East-window while the roof is cycled, or to present Altar-plate while a miserable deal table serves as the Altar? And yet how often does one hear of such things, and hear of them too, in terms of approbation.

26. Stained glass is a very favourite gift, in all conditions of a church. I do not wish to speak harshly of

What distinction is meant by necessary and ornamental restorations.  
Stained glass.

those who are contributing to the honour of the Sanctuary, but I cannot help fearing that the showiness of the present has something to do with the frequency of its selection. If, for example, a decayed window were carefully restored, or a magnificent door repaired, in a few years all traces of the restoration would be lost, from the softening of the new work into the old; and the name of the restorer would consequently be forgotten by men. The case is different with a present of stained glass, the name of the donor being long held in memory. Far be it from me to say, that there is no piety in church restoration, even when debased by such a motive as this: I only say that it much detracts from the merit of the deed, and that it probably would not be owned, nor it may be, consciously felt, by many who are in reality influenced by it.

27. I entreat therefore such persons as are meditating any benefaction to the House of God to make it decent, before they make it comely. The very title of our Homily on that subject reads an excellent lesson. *Of* (1) REPAIRING *and* (2) KEEPING CLEAN, *and* (when all this has been done) (3) *comely adorning of churches*. Imagine the restoration of a ruined cottage commenced by filling the windows with stained glass! And yet—I could almost say it with tears—I have seen churches which for damp, filth, and ruin, are worse off than a habitable English cottage; where there is ingress for birds and loathsome reptiles, and the Altar is defiled by the one, and the corners and pews tenanted by the other: and where abominations are permitted around the walls, and sometimes even in the belfry, which heathens would have trembled to be guilty of in their temples.

28. I am most willing to allow that a clergyman, Chancel may be completely restored first. by way of shewing what a church ought to be, may fairly proceed to bestow on his Chancel the richest ornament of which it is capable, even should he be unable to induce the Parish to make even necessary repairs, as that part of the church which they are bound to preserve. But few seem to be aware of what is meant by decency in a church. I have often been struck with seeing clergymen, whom I have known to be zealous for God's honour, point out some elaborate sedilia, or beautiful tomb, perishing through age, or destroyed through Puritan wickedness, and descant on their beauties in a manner that shewed them possessed of feeling as well as taste, yet apparently never have thought of restoring or renewing them. In effigies more especially, this is the case. Many will execrate the hands that mutilated a figure in brass; yet who thinks of sending for alabaster for the one, or applying to the engraver for the production of the pieces necessary for the restoration

of the other? How often do we see the hands of some beautiful figure sawn off! and yet I never saw a restoration attempted in this case, though it would be so very easy. How often is the canopy of some magnificent brass imperfect, when a very trifling expense would restore it to its original beauty.

29. The question then arises, What is necessary for decency in a Chancel? And the following questions may help to set the matter in a clearer light.

Is there a proper course of drain-tiles round it, with a correspondence of eaves and gutters above?

Is the whole of the stone-work in the interior, piers, if there are any, sedilia, piscina, Easter sepulchre, window-sills, jambs, tracery, shafts, chancel-arch, monuments, free from white-wash or paint, stucco, and in good and sound condition?

Is any deficiency supplied with Roman or other cement? (which is almost worse than leaving it unsupplied.)

Is the roof free from all cieling and lath and plaster-work?

Is every beam distinctly visible from below?

Is all the wood employed in it or otherwise, oak or chestnut?

Is any deception practised, (a kind of architectural hypocrisy) by graining deal to look like oak, and the like?

Is the Roodscreen with the doors perfect?

Is the Priest's door perfect, of oak, with well-worked stancheons, and only used for the entrance and egress of the Priest?

Is the Altar, of stone, if not, of costly wood?

Are there Altar-cloths, a napkin, 'fair linen,' and other things necessary for the Holy Mysteries?

Are there suitable vessels for them, of silver at the least, and Altar candlesticks?

Is there a Table of Prothesis or credence in the shape of a bracket, recess, or otherwise?

Is all the exterior work, parapet, pinnacles, pierced battlements, crockets, &c. perfect; the decays resulting from the weather duly restored?

Is there a cross at the East end? and this not, as is too often the case, *plain*, (which involves both an architectural and religious solecism,) but *floriated*?

Is the roof of some superior material to common slate or red tiles,—such as grey slate, lead, shingles, or Hersham slate? Is the floor laid throughout with encaustic tiles, those towards the East end at least being glazed?

Is there any cement or composition or whitewash on the outside? (The only possible exception to an universal condemnation

of these articles is, that *whitewash* may *perhaps* be *allowed* over *rubble* in the *interior*.)

Is any part restored with brick?

30. If all these questions can be answered favourably, then any additional money may be laid out in stained glass: but *till they are*, it should not be thought of. And how few, how very few are the churches in which such an answer could be given! It may be proper to observe, that it is a widely different case where ancient stained glass is in question: here its preservation should be made one of the earliest subjects of anxiety.

31. There are several practical difficulties in the arrangement of an ancient church, which,—though I firmly believe that a more self-denying age would think little of them—are nevertheless in the present state of things, real difficulties; and if I may be allowed the expression, *tease* a clergyman far more than things of much higher moment. So many applications are continually made to us on the subject, that it may be well to devote a few more words to it than it may, in the opinion of some, seem to merit.

32. The position of the organ is one of the things which is often a great trouble. Nine-tenths of the organs in this kingdom stand in a Western gallery. This, of course, falls under the condemnation we have agreed to pronounce on all galleries: and there are many other objections to this position, whether for organ or singers. In country churches, the singing loft, during the performance of the Psalm or Hymn, becomes the cynosure of all eyes: the worshippers, or they who should be such, generally turn to it as to a center of attraction. Messages, too, pass during the time of Divine Service between the “first violin” and the clerk, if that anomalous personage be employed, and the noise on the gallery stairs frequently overpowers every other sound. Then, what can be more ludicrous than the slate suspended in front of the gallery, stamped with the letters AN. or PS.? Nothing, too, can be worse as respects the singers themselves. Removed too great distance from the clergyman’s eye, having a separate entrance to their seats, and why. possessed of strong *esprit du corps*, and feeling or thinking themselves indispensable to the performance of a certain part of public worship, and too often, alas! privileged to decide what that part shall be,—what wonder if they generally acquire those feelings of independence and pride, which make the singers some of the worst members of the parish. The radicalism both of

singers and of bell-ringers is notorious. And where women-singers are allowed, and part-anthems sung, the notice which they attract from their station in front of the gallery might well enough befit a theatre, but is highly indecorous in the House of God.

33. Add to which that we have here a striking instance of the perverseness of modern times. None ought to be in the Chancel but they who are taking an actual part in the performance of the Divine Office, *and they ought*. Now not only are all kinds of people admitted into, or even stationed in the Chancel, but they who ought to be there, namely the singers, are removed as far as possible from it. That the singing in a church would be materially improved by a separation of the voices from the music is an inferior argument, but with some may have its due weight.

34. In other churches, the organ is in one of the Transepts; which position, though it does not block an arch, as the other does, conceals one, if not more windows, and has all the other objections of the first named plan. And others again have the organ over the vestry: both forming a kind of side chapel to the Chancel. This is a practice recently introduced, and adopted in two churches where great pains have been taken to obtain a Catholic arrangement. But I cannot recommend it. Besides its want of authority, another objection is, that it gives the Sacristy, which if it ever exists, should be very small, a most undue prominence, and makes it open to the Chancel by an arch, whereas it should open by a door. It would be better, if any position of this kind were thought of, to place it in an open parvise over the Porch: though this arrangement would still be liable to the first objection.

35. Another position still remains to be noticed: that adopted in most of our Cathedrals, and in some of our large parish churches: namely, between the Chancel and Nave. Now I willingly allow that this position has, in the case of our Cathedrals, been attended with some happy practical results: namely, the preservation of the Roodscreen, and the practical separation of the Choir from the Nave. This distinction, though it may seem, in the present state of things, of little consequence, may yet be of essential service when the separation of the laity from the Clergy is again insisted on. But it has led to lamentable consequences, in

the total uselessness into which the Naves have fallen, and the great disfigurement of the whole effect of the Cathedral, in cutting the vista short by the organ. And the arrangement is never, or very seldom, in use in parish churches, except where, as at Beverley, and Tewkesbury, and Selby, the Choir is the only part used for service.

36. It follows then, that the best place for an organ is on the floor. This is opposed by an inveterate, but foolish prejudice: the sound is not at all affected thereby; and indeed is likely to be superior to that which issues from the confined apartments in which some organs are pent.

37. Another point, concerning which enquiry is often made, is the best method of lighting a church. With a protest against the modern practice of evening services, I may proceed to observe, that of all methods, that by gas appears to me the most objectionable. There is an artificialness, and luxury, and glare about it, ill suiting to the sobriety and solemnity of a Temple of God: it involves a necessity of laying pipes in all directions, and pulling about the sacred walls very frequently: it leads to the introduction of hideous gas-holders: it can never be made perfectly safe: it must always be *uncertain*—almost every one has heard of instances where churches have been left in total darkness; the pipes are generally made to run up the piers, concealed in channels cut in the masonry; with all manner of ingenious contrivances for hiding a pipe here, and a meter there: than which nothing is more at variance with the principles of reality which it has always been our great aim to inculcate. Wax lights, disposed in standards are far less objectionable: and in small or poor churches may do well enough. But the proper method is the use of Chandeliers, (*Coronæ lucis* as they used to be called) filled with wax lights, and admitting the most delicate and beautiful carving.

38. The fence for the churchyard should, in towns, be of stone: in the country an oak paling, or even a hedge, may also be employed. But cast iron rails are carefully to be avoided: indeed in the whole furniture of a church, nothing made by casting can possibly be allowed. Metals, even for the meanest uses, such as stanchions, door-plates, &c. should be *carved*.

Method of warming a church.

39. We will lastly consider—and it is a very important subject—the best method of warming a church. It may seem regardless of the poor, it may seem a sacrifice of necessity to ornament: it may seem an impossible recommendation, but I still say it, and that with the fullest conviction that I am speaking not more for the church than for the worshippers,—DO WITHOUT A STOVE. For, *firstly*, a stove of whatever shape or kind is a great disfigurement to a church. *Secondly*, it must either stand in the middle of one of the passages, in which case it will block up and incommode the way, or it must occupy a space sufficient to accommodate at least eight or ten people, since none can sit close to a stove without running the risk of being burnt, or suffocated, or both. *Thirdly*, stoves not only diffuse an unequal and an uncertain warmth, but they are unwholesome and unsafe. *Fourthly*, they require either a concealed flue under the floor, or a frightful iron pipe to convey the smoke above. Now the former of these cases is liable to the objections urged against gas, and generally against all concealed and disguised constructions; in the latter, the funnel must be carried either through the roof, a window, or a wall. In the first case the danger from fire is very great; in the next, it causes a grievous and unsightly mutilation; in the last, it weakens and discolours the walls. *Patent chunk* stoves, and the rest of the inventions, happily enough eulogized by the makers as fitted for assembly rooms, dissenting ‘chapels,’ or churches, are hideous in themselves, and never give much heat, except when they happen to set the building on fire. *Fifthly*, a stove is often a mere excuse to counteract damp, loose doors, decayed windows, and chinks in walls, which ought to be remedied in a very different as well as much more effectual way; for persons exposed to cold draughts in a hot building, and afterwards coming out suddenly into the cold air, are much more liable to harm than those who have to sit without any fire at all. *Lastly*, ‘What man has done, man may do.’ It is an undeniable fact, that up to the Restoration there were no fires in churches, and the winters were then at least as severe as now.

How to be warmed.

40. When the doors and windows of a church are made to fasten tightly, and to shut closely, when pues are removed which prevent a free circulation of air, when the church is kept thoroughly dry. When the air is admitted freely, much will be done towards warming the building. Much more will be done when it is crowded twice a day for Daily Service. A church tolerably well attended is never cold on Monday morning: why need it be on any other morning? It was by means like these that our ancestors and foreign Catholics were and are enabled to do without fires. The use of incense also tended to dry and warm the

air: and this, it is matter of fact, was discontinued only in the great rebellion. Finally, our ancestors were more self-denying than we: they did not go to church to be comfortable, but to pray: for that they did occasionally feel the cold is evident from the use of the *pomander*, a vessel in the shape of a silver apple full of hot water, which enabled the officiating priest, in bitter weather to warm his hands, that he might be able to grasp the Chalice securely.

Conclusion.           42. Thus then, I conclude these hints: under the hope, that if they appear trifling to some, they may not be without use in affording advice on the best methods of church enlargement and church arrangements to the parish priest.

---









