





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

John G. Fuller
Primary Charge

1884

TWO ADDRESSES

Delivered to the Clergy

OF THE

Diocese of Durham

IN

DECEMBER, 1882.

BY

J. B. LIGHTFOOT, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.,

BISHOP OF DURHAM

London.

MACMILLAN AND CO.

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

1851

INDEX.

	PAGE
GENERAL - - - - -	3
I. THE DIOCESE - - - - -	4
(1) <i>Territorial Rearrangements.</i>	
(i) Division of the Diocese - - - - -	5
(ii) New Archdeaconry - - - - -	15
(iii) Rearrangement of Rural Deaneries - - - - -	19
(iv) Subdivision of Parishes - - - - -	21
(2) <i>Diocesan Institutions and Associations.</i>	
(i) Diocesan Conference - - - - -	23
(ii) Diocesan Societies - - - - -	27
(iii) Organization of Lay Help - - - - -	28
(iv) Lay Readers - - - - -	30
(v) Ministration of Women - - - - -	33
(vi) Girls' Friendly Society and Young Men's Friendly Society - - - - -	35
(vii) Diocesan Preachers - - - - -	37
(3) <i>Miscellaneous.</i>	
(i) Ordinations - - - - -	40
(ii) Meeting of Curates - - - - -	42
(iii) Confirmations - - - - -	43
(iv) Church Building and Restoration - - - - -	45
(v) Diocesan Calendar and Magazine - - - - -	46
(4) <i>Retrospective and Prospective.</i> - - - - -	47
II. THE CHURCH.	
(1) Burial Laws Amendment Act - - - - -	55
(2) Permanent Diaconate - - - - -	61
(3) Salvation Army - - - - -	67
(4) Revised New Testament - - - - -	77
(5) Vestments - - - - -	82
(6) Church and State - - - - -	86
(7) Anxieties and Hopes - - - - -	89
NOTES - - - - -	95

The first part of this Charge was delivered in Durham Cathedral, before the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Durham, on Thursday, December 14th; the second in the Chapel of Auckland Castle, before the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Auckland, on Saturday, December 16th.

A CHARGE.

REVEREND BRETHEREN,

THE SOLEMNITY of the occasion will be felt by all who are met together to-day. This is far more than an ordinary gathering of clergy, whether for social interchange or for mutual consultation or even for common worship. We have arrived at one of those marked halting-places in our ministerial journey, where, resting for a moment, we look behind and before us; and taught alike by the failures and achievements of the past, we gird ourselves up for a fresh start and a more energetic race in the future. A visitation is a great audit time, when the Bishop and Clergy alike render an account of their ministrations—the Clergy by their answers to the questions of their diocesan—the Bishop by his charge summing up the work of the diocese during the few years past. It is a foreshadowing and a forecast of the great and final visitation, when the Master Himself returning shall demand an account of His talents, when the Chief Shepherd shall reappear and require His flock at our hands.

On this my primary visitation my thoughts naturally revert to the day when, full of misgivings, I first came among you between three and four years ago. The more than kindly welcome which I received from clergy and laity alike reassured me. The hopes with which your attitude then inspired me have not been disappointed. I have not escaped, and I do not desire to escape, criticism. I have striven to administer this diocese with moderation indeed, but without fear or favour of men; and he who sets this ideal before him, must expect to disappoint many and perhaps to offend a few. To the generous forbearance, the ready deference, the frank counsel, and the hearty co-operation of all—of the clergy more especially—I am indebted for any measure of success which may have attended my administration since my coming among you. To this same cause I owe it, that I address you to-day with a courage and a hopefulness which three years and a half ago I should not have thought possible.

I.

The Diocese.1. *TERRITORIAL REARRANGEMENTS.*(i) *Division of the Diocese.*

A great and momentous change has overtaken the diocese since the last visitation—a change more considerable in itself and more important in its prospective results than any since the establishment of the see at Durham, if we except the abolition of

the Palatine jurisdiction in 1836. The See of Durham has been shorn of two-thirds of its area and one-third of its population. It has been severed from the cradle of its race—the sacred island of Lindisfarne. It has lost an appreciable part of its income and its patronage. Nevertheless this change, now that it is made, must be a subject of unalloyed joy and thankfulness to all who have at heart the well-being and efficiency of the Church of England. When I was working for the division of the diocese, I was met again and again with the objection—frankly stated and, I doubt not, sincerely held—that the dignity and prestige of the ancient See of Durham would suffer irreparably by the change. My constant reply has been that the dignity and prestige of the see existed only for the sake of its efficiency, and that the sacrifice must be made, if it were needed. But I do not think that any real loss of dignity has been incurred. I cannot imagine that the mother see will suffer at all in influence or importance, because a daughter, who is bone of her bone and flesh of her flesh, has gone forth from her home to win the hearts and stir the souls of men. She will be all the stronger and all the prouder for such a motherhood as this. Certainly I should be the least inclined of all men, whether from my personal interests in the see or from my historical sympathies with the past, to consent calmly to any real diminution of the glories of the ancient bishopric. But no local severance can impair the historical connexion. Columba and

Aidan are still our spiritual forefathers; Lindisfarne and Hexham are still our ancestral homes, though we have given them as a marriage portion to our daughter. We cling as firmly, as eagerly, as resolutely, as ever, to all that is noble, all that is true, all that is enduring, all that is Christlike, in the Northumbrian Church in the past.

I need not remind you that the creation of a see for Northumberland, carved out of the Diocese of Durham, is not a project of yesterday. It was foreshadowed in the well-known Act of Henry VIII, which authorized the appointment of a suffragan Bishop of Berwick to act as the Bishop of Durham's lieutenant.¹ It was carried out at least on paper by an Act of the Legislature towards the close of the next reign. This Act provided for the establishment of a Bishopric of Newcastle, with the usual accompaniment of a Dean and Chapter. Happily it never took effect. No blessing could have been expected to rest on a measure prompted by the most selfish motives and carried out by the most unscrupulous means. The aggrandizement of the most rapacious and worldly of courtiers—John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland—was the primary incentive to the change. The humiliation of the See of Durham was a secondary but not unimportant object in the eyes of its author. The deprivation and imprisonment of the learned, gentle, moderate Tunstall—the most blameless of prelates—was the immediate preliminary to the step.²

Thus the Act, though decked out with specious phrases and high-sounding professions of concern for the welfare of the diocese, was a mere measure of spoliation, prompted by the greed and ambition of one man. It was altogether of the earth earthy; and it deserved to perish. Perish it did speedily. Its rescission was one of the earliest measures of the succeeding reign. From that time forward nothing more is heard of the scheme till the present generation. However beneficial in itself, it had been hopelessly discredited by its origin and its motive. The Bishops of Durham, burdened with the cares of a secular principedom in addition to their spiritual functions, continued to perform the duties of their office unaided. Even the permissive Act of Henry VIII, which granted a suffragan to the Bishop of Durham, was only once called into requisition, though in mediæval times the Bishop of Durham had not unfrequently employed some Bishop *in partibus* as suffragan. One Dr. Sparke, Master of Greatham Hospital in Queen Elizabeth's time, was the first and last Bishop of Berwick on record.

But the See of Durham, however wide in area, was not as yet very densely peopled. The whole population of the diocese, comprising the two present counties of Northumberland and Durham, with a peninsula stretching into Cumberland and islets dotted over the north of Yorkshire, was less at the commencement of this century, than the present population of any English diocese except

Hereford. But the century had hardly set in, when the census rose by rapid bounds. The population of the two counties is now four or five times as great as it was in the opening years of the century. This increase has been much more rapid in Durham than in Northumberland. In 1801 Durham numbered fewer inhabitants than Northumberland by twenty thousand; in 1831 it had outstripped its neighbour and counted some few thousands more; and in 1881 it reckoned double the population of Northumberland though containing only half the acreage.³ No wonder that with these rapidly growing numbers earnest and thoughtful men began to desire for the diocese more effective spiritual supervision. The Bishops of Durham had been relieved from the cares of the Palatinate not a moment too soon. But this relief was more than counterbalanced by the ever increasing pressure of work and the ever heightened ideal of episcopal duty—an ideal springing from the general revival of Church life, but owing not a little to the devoted labours of men like Blomfield and Wilberforce.

Accordingly in the year 1854 the Town Council of Newcastle, by a unanimous vote, memorialized the Home Secretary for the creation of a see in their midst on the ground that owing to the increase of the population 'the effective administration of the diocese had become impossible'; and about the same time the Cathedral Commissioners, who were then sitting, received more than one memorial from the County of

Northumberland to the same effect. In one of these the memorialists put forward the plea that 'the diocese contained an estimated population of 770,000.' This estimate had nearly doubled before the see was actually created. The Commissioners themselves, reporting in the following year (1855), mention the fact that 'local efforts of considerable importance have already been made at Newcastle for the creation of a new see there,' and they themselves include it in their schedule. At the first Church Congress also, held at Cambridge in 1861, in which the increase of the episcopate was one of the subjects discussed, Durham was placed in the forefront of the dioceses which needed division.⁴

For long years however local agitation slumbered. Here and there a voice was raised, but no common action was taken. Outside the diocese of Durham however the movement did not rest. The creation of the see of Ripon in 1836 could not be called an extension of the episcopate, for it was purchased by the suppression of another bishopric. Yet the beneficent effects of the division of an overgrown diocese and the planting of a see in the heart of a populous district were soon manifest in the fruits of Bishop Longley's episcopate; and this may be regarded as the first step in the onward progress. The lesson taught by the creation of Ripon in 1836 was further enforced by the creation of Manchester in 1847. This latter was the first real addition to the English episcopate since Henry the VIII's time,

though the population of England had increased five or sixfold during the three centuries which had elapsed meanwhile. So the cry for an increase of the episcopate rose ever louder and louder from the Church. A Society for the extension of the Home Episcopate was founded. The Premier was memorialized. Comprehensive measures of extension were again and again brought before Parliament. At length it was seen to be more politic to attack the need in detail. Special wants must be supplied by special measures. The result of this change of procedure was the immediate creation of two new sees. St. Alban's was founded in 1875; Truro in the following year. Each see created was a fresh indication of the wisdom of these measures. Immediate and manifest results followed in the quickening of Church life.⁵

At length Durham awoke again. In the year 1876 the late Bishop of Durham submitted to his Ruridecanal Chapters the advisability of creating a new see for Northumberland. Though there was much difference of opinion as to the mode of endowment, 'the judgment was almost unanimous as to the advisableness of creating the see.' In the following year (August 1877) Mr. T. Hedley—the inheritor of a name famous in the annals of inventive science—bequeathed his personal estate after certain deductions and on certain conditions for the endowment of such a bishopric. This munificent bequest clinched the measure. In the following year (1878) an Act passed the legislature for the creation of four

new sees, Liverpool, Newcastle, Southwell, and Wakefield. The Archbishop of Canterbury speaking on the second reading of the Bill characterised the measure as "one of the greatest reforms proposed for the Church of England since the Reformation," and looked forward to it as a "means of greatly strengthening the Church." My predecessor in this diocese also strongly advocated the measure on that occasion. This was, I believe, the last time that his voice was heard in the House of Lords. In his last charge, delivered a few months later, he commended the foundation of the See of Newcastle to the diocese as a measure much needed, giving his reasons for this opinion, and referring to the decision of the Ruridecanal Chapters which I have already mentioned. But he was not sanguine about the result. 'The prospect,' he said, 'of the accomplishment of this good work is, I fear, remote.'⁶

The division of the diocese was thus bequeathed to me as a legacy by my predecessor. As this topic was prominent in his last public utterances to the diocese, so also it had a conspicuous place in my first words spoken among you. Preaching at my enthronement, I expressed the hope that 'the inauguration of a new episcopate might be marked by the creation of a new see; that Northumberland which in centuries long past gave to Durham her bishopric might receive from Durham her due in return in these latest days; and that the New Castle on the Tyne might take its place with the Old Castle on the Wear, as a spiritual

fortress strong in the warfare of God.' But before this I had taken one important step. Immediately after my appointment I had sought an interview with the Duke of Northumberland and received from him the promise of the munificent gift (£10,000) which was the foundation stone of the undertaking. Thus the measure which, promoted three centuries and a half earlier by the greed and ambition of one Duke of Northumberland had proved abortive, was destined in our days to be realized by the unselfish munificence of another. I pledged myself then and there, that the success of the measure was assured by his generosity ; and the other day, when he presided at the reception of the Bishop of Newcastle, thereby crowning the work which he himself had begun, I was able to remind him of the pledge thus given and redeemed. But the cloud still hung heavily over these northern counties when I came among you. It was a period of almost unparalleled commercial and agricultural depression. The special industries of the diocese had suffered perhaps more than any others. By the termination of the strikes and the resumption of work the worst anxiety had indeed been removed ; but confidence was not restored. Not only had great losses been incurred in the past ; but a sense of instability, than which nothing is more fatal to charitable benefactions on a large scale, had been engendered. For the time therefore I held my hand, warned on all sides that it would be fatal to move at a moment so inopportune. Thus fifteen

months elapsed since I entered my diocese, when the first Diocesan Conference assembled towards the end of September, 1880. Meanwhile a spur had been applied to our tardiness. The See of Liverpool was an accomplished fact. The people of Liverpool had busied themselves with zeal, and the great wealth of the place ensured them an early success. In my opening address at the Conference I referred at length to the foundation of the See of Newcastle as a measure of immediate and pressing importance. The division of the diocese was also one of the subjects on the programme. Excellent papers were read on it, and an interesting discussion ensued. I stated on this occasion that the first consecration in which I had been called to take part was the consecration of a Bishop for Liverpool, and that it was my earnest prayer that the second might be the consecration of a Bishop for Newcastle. I added also the hope that this stirring of the question at the Diocesan Conference would 'prove the beginning of the end.'

The prayer was granted; the hope was fulfilled. That day did prove 'the beginning of the end.' The first printed circular was issued, if I recollect rightly, soon after the Conference. Within fifteen months from that date we were able to announce publicly that the requisite endowment had been obtained and that the establishment of the new see was therefore an assured fact. For the first few months I kept the matter in my own hands, until I was able to announce that two-thirds of the sum

required in addition to Mr. Hedley's legacy had been secured. At length in December, 1880, a committee was called together; and a more general and active canvass was commenced. To the executive committee, and more especially to its treasurers and secretaries, I desire here to record my sincere thanks for their energetic labours. To the clergy generally, and more especially to the Rural Deans and Archdeacons, the speedy success of the measure is largely indebted. The Archdeacons above all (one alas! is no longer with us to receive this expression of my thanks) have laid me under the deepest obligation. Speaking at Newcastle, early in June 1881, I had expressed the hope that I might be able to announce the completion of the fund at the Congress which was fixed for the ensuing October. This hope was not gratified. The Congress met, and I had still to ask '*Usquequo Domine.*' But a great impulse was given to the work by this meeting. A special Congress Fund was established at the suggestion of the Bishop of Manchester and under the direction of the then Archdeacon of Northumberland. We were now approaching the limit at which it might be possible by careful investment and by guarantees to establish the bishopric shortly, when the princely gift of Benwell Tower, as the episcopal residence, dispensed with any anxiety about guarantees, gave us a large margin, scattered all misgivings, and rescued us from further delay. The gift was made known privately by the donor in the

middle of October 1881, though not published till later. Thus less than thirteen months from the time when active steps were first taken had sufficed to secure the foundation of the see. The signal munificence of Mr. Spencer was not the less welcome because it came after the establishment of the see was assured. From first to last the sum raised for the endowment, including Mr. Hedley's benefaction, amounted to above £70,000, besides the gift of the episcopal residence. Unlike Liverpool, we received nothing from the Additional Home Bishoprics Fund, which was already more than exhausted by promises made elsewhere. St. Alban's, Truro, Liverpool, Newcastle, have been added to the list of English sees within a period of five years. Southwell and Wakefield, we trust, will not long be delayed. The endowments for these new sees have been raised mainly by voluntary contributions. This fact has had no parallel in the history of the English Church for many centuries. The number of additional bishoprics under Henry VIII was slightly greater, but they cost their founder nothing. Yet this is only one out of many signal fruits of the great awakening in the life of the Church which we have been permitted to witness in our generation. Have we not good cause to thank God and take courage?'

(ii) *The New Archdeaconry.*

Only second in importance to the creation of a new see in the territorial re-arrangements of

the diocese has been the creation of a new archdeaconry. Even, if the division of the diocese had not been imminent, the division of the Archdeaconry of Durham would have been a pressing need. The County of Durham, with its exceptional administrative difficulties, with its ever increasing and ever shifting population, and with the incessant parochial developments and readjustments rendered necessary thereby, had outgrown the powers of one Archdeacon however energetic. But the time was fast approaching when the county would become co-extensive with the diocese, and it was a striking anomaly that a Bishop of one of the chief English sees, still retaining an exceptionally large population, should be dependent on the co-operation of a single Archdeacon. It is true that the Archdeaconry was in some degree relieved by the Officialty. But the relief was more nominal than real; and, as a matter of fact, the Officialty had of recent years been held with one or other archdeaconry, latterly with the Archdeaconry of Durham. As the parishes included in the Officialty are scattered up and down the Archdeaconry of Durham, this arrangement was perhaps as convenient as the circumstances permitted. Moreover the Officialty was itself an anomaly. It originated in a privilege granted in Norman times to the Prior of Durham by the Bishops to exercise independent jurisdiction over the cures supplied by the monastic house. To these parishes the Prior was regarded as Archdeacon; and after the Reformation this jurisdiction devolved on the Dean

as his representative. Though it might have been exercised by him in person, he generally delegated it to an Official, elected by the Dean and Chapter. The anomaly was thus twofold. In the first place the archidiaconal jurisdiction of the Official was not marked by continuous geographical boundaries, like an ordinary archdeaconry. His territory was sporadic. It was an archidiaconate within an archidiaconate. But secondly (and this was the greatest anomaly) it was quite independent of the Bishop. The Official was not only not appointed by the Bishop but was independent of the Bishop. He was not the Bishop's eye, but the Dean's eye. Thus the parishes of the Officialty, so far as regards the episcopal supervision exercised through the Archdeacon, were peculiars. The anomaly was probably unimportant, when it was first created; but as the patronage of the Dean and Chapter increased, it became more flagrant. At the time of its abolition it included not less than 48 parishes, and this number would have grown from time to time by the formation of new parishes. When I applied to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners for the creation of the new Archdeaconry of Auckland, they at once laid their finger on this blot. At first I pleaded for the retention of the Officialty. Though the exemption (in one important respect) of a large number of parishes from episcopal jurisdiction was an irregularity indefensible in itself, yet it had been so worked as to be unproductive of any real evil beyond the inconvenience; and I could not but respect the

sentiments and attachments which had gathered about an institution dating eight centuries back and connected with the name of William of Carileph. But the Commissioners conceived their duty to be clear. A main purpose of their existence was the abolition of peculiars. By Act of Parliament they were charged to see that every parish in its entirety was comprised in one rural deanery, and every rural deanery in its entirety in one archdeaconry. Thus the letter not less than the spirit of the statute seemed to them to demand the abolition of the Officialty, as a preliminary to the creation of the Archdeaconry. Moreover they had a strong precedent for this mode of dealing with the matter. When the Archdeaconry of Lindisfarne was carved out of the Archdeaconry of Northumberland in 1842, the jurisdiction of the Officialty in the County of Northumberland was abolished, and the parishes comprised in it were assigned to the respective archdeaconries in which they were situated. This was an exactly analogous case, and the Officialty was doomed. With the consent of the Dean and Chapter therefore, and with the generous acquiescence of the then Official, Archdeacon Prest, who expressed his willingness to resign at any moment, the measure was passed. By an Order in Council dated May 3, 1882, the Officialty was abolished. By a second Order, signed at the next Council, May 17, the Archdeaconry of Auckland was created. More important administrative functions have always been assigned to the Archdeacons in this diocese than in most others—

with very real advantage to the Church. From their wise, energetic, and loyal co-operation I have received the greatest assistance; and I anticipate a substantial gain to the diocese from the division of the Archdeaconry of Durham. The Officialty will doubtless cease to be represented in Convocation; but practically the representation of the diocese as a whole will be increased. Two Proctors of the new Archdeaconry will be substituted for the two Proctors of the Officialty at the next Convocation; while the two Archdeacons will replace the one member in whose person the Archdeaconry of Durham and the Officialty were united.⁸

(iii) *Re-arrangement of Rural Deaneries.*

After the creation of the new Archdeaconry the re-arrangement of the Rural Deaneries stands next in order. As a matter of history however the reform of the Rural Deaneries preceded the reform of the Archdeaconries. The Deaneries, as I found them, still remained as they had been arranged by Bishop Longley a quarter of a century ago, when he revived the office of Rural Dean. On what principle he went—whether he worked upon any ancient ecclesiastical lines or whether he followed certain civil divisions—I do not know. But with the lapse of time his arrangement had become inadequate and inconvenient—inadequate, for seven Rural Deaneries were quite insufficient for a county whose population was fast mounting to 900,000—inconvenient, for

parishes territorially and civilly associated together were for ecclesiastical purposes severed by the existing boundaries. The City of Durham for instance was partly in West Chester, partly in South Easington; and so in like manner the borough of Sunderland was bisected, Monkwearmouth falling to East Chester and Bishopwearmouth to North Easington—the river Wear having been taken in both these cases as the frontier line. This inconvenience alone would have prompted some change in the arrangement, even if there had not been an immediate motive for action. But I had decided on summoning a Diocesan Conference; and, as the representation in the Conference was intended to be based on the ruridecanal divisions of the diocese, the readjustment of the latter was a necessary preliminary. Accordingly I obtained the sanction of the Commissioners to a scheme which was gazetted on July 9, 1880, and by which the County, then co-extensive with the Archdeaconry of Durham, was divided into eleven Rural Deaneries in place of the previous seven. The Rural Deaneries are still very large—at least in population, if not in acreage—compared with the corresponding arrangements in some other dioceses. Thus I find that in S. Alban's, which has about the same population as the reduced Diocese of Durham, there are 46 Deaneries; and that in Norwich, where the population is, roughly speaking, two-thirds of our own, the Deaneries are 41 in number. But the proportions vary widely in different dioceses; and I do not think too great subdivision in that

respect advisable. The value of the Ruridecanal Chapters and Conferences consists not a little in the power of association and the sense of Church membership which they foster; and this advantage would be seriously impaired if a Deanery comprised only very near neighbours who were constantly meeting together for other purposes. One or two of the Deaneries are perhaps still inconveniently large, but these may easily be divided, if necessary, at a later date.⁹

(iv) *Subdivision of Parishes.*

I have spoken of territorial readjustments—diocesan, archidiaconal, ruridecanal. One other branch of this subject still remains—the parochial. The subdivision of the large and populous parishes is a matter of the highest moment for the spiritual welfare of the diocese. My predecessor in his last charge, delivered four years ago, expressed his opinion that ‘the limit to the formation of new districts had almost been reached.’ Commenting on these words at our Diocesan Conference in 1880, I said that I did not discern at the time any signs of flagging in this work of parochial subdivision. Looking back from a higher vantage ground now, and ranging over a wider space of time, I see that there has been a sensible abatement. During the four years since the last visitation only 9 new ecclesiastical districts have been formed, though 11 other districts already formed have been created into parishes on the consecration of their churches. A comparison with the statistics of

former years shows that the abatement began in 1876. It is due partly to the fact that the impulse given by the census of 1871 had spent itself, partly to the circumstance that the years of depression which ensued tended to paralyse a movement which before all things required a considerable expenditure of money, but still more perhaps to the cause foreseen by Bishop Baring, that such a movement must from its very nature exhaust itself in time. This time however has not yet arrived. The census of 1881, which exhibits an increase of 182,000 in the population of the County of Durham alone, has revealed great and startling deficiencies in our spiritual agencies. Before the statistics of this census were known, I sent a circular to the Rural Deans, requesting them to furnish me with information as to the readjustment of parochial boundaries and the creation of new parishes which they considered urgent or desirable in their respective Deaneries. As the result of this enquiry, combined with the statistics of the census since made known, I find that at least fifteen new parishes ought to be created in the present Diocese of Durham alone, if the parochial system is to be maintained on a reasonably efficient scale. I will take two typical instances. The parish of S. Paul's, Hendon, in the borough of Sunderland, was formed in 1854. It has already been once subdivided—the parish of S. Barnabas having been formed in 1876. But notwithstanding this relief its population now amounts to 18,000 or 19,000; and, though a town population is

necessarily more or less compact, the very numbers plead for immediate subdivision. The rural district of Crook presents a different type of parish, but the need of relief here is equally pressing. It was created in 1845, and has since been reduced by the formation of the daughter parish of Stanley which now contains a population of more than 3,800. Nevertheless the population of the parish thus reduced has mounted up to 10,000 or 11,000, and these are not gathered into one centre but scattered through several hamlets lying at great distances from Crook itself. The creation of these new parishes deserves immediate attention. In many cases the initial steps have been already taken, and in some the arrangements are approaching completion. But it depends largely on the generosity of the laity whether all these crying wants of the diocese can be promptly supplied.¹⁰

2. *DIOCESAN INSTITUTIONS AND ASSOCIATIONS.*

(i) *Diocesan Conference.*

The first Diocesan Conference was held in September, 1880. We met with some misgiving, for this was a fresh experiment in the Diocese of Durham; we parted with feelings of deep thankfulness for the result. All present must have been impressed by the character of the papers and the tone of the discussions. It is a great advantage for the clergy and laity of the diocese to have periodically these opportunities of interchanging thoughts on the great work which lies before them, even if no immediate practical measures

are carried out through the agency of these conferences. In the present instance the direct result was the appointment of some important committees, which have already borne fruit.

The future conduct of the Diocesan Conferences is still under consideration. The composition of the body is open to revision, if revision is necessary. The reduction of the diocese has made a larger representation possible, should it be thought desirable. Nor again has it yet been decided how often the meetings shall be held. The first Conference could only be regarded as preliminary and tentative. The Newcastle Congress in 1881, the Visitation in 1882, have interposed and suspended our meetings hitherto. Now that all obstacles are removed, it is time that rules should be laid down fixing the intervals and the times of meeting. Then again we ought to see our way with regard to our modes of procedure. I believe that we did wisely at our first Conference in confining ourselves to discussion without voting on the questions brought before us. But we shall have, soon or late, to consider whether it is advisable or not to continue this self-imposed restraint. These three seem to me to be the main points to which the committee appointed at our first Diocesan Conference will have to direct their attention, and their recommendations will be awaited with deep interest.¹¹

Before I pass away from this subject of our Diocesan Conference, I must advert to one subject of great importance and of no little perplexity. You are

doubtless aware that a Central Council of Diocesan Conferences has been formed, composed of six delegates—three lay and three clerical—from each diocese which is willing to send representatives. The main object of this Association, as stated in its own words, is to obtain the general opinion of the Church at large on matters affecting its welfare, with a view to their being brought prominently, if thought desirable, before the Convocations and Parliament. It is stated that as many as twenty-three Diocesan Conferences have approved this Association, and appointed delegates to it. When I was asked in like manner to name members to represent our Conference I did not see my way to complying with the invitation. As the question had not been brought before my Diocesan Conference, I could not assume that it would take a favourable view of the measure. As a matter of fact more than one Diocesan Conference has since declined to recognize this Central Association. Moreover persons appointed by myself alone could not in any true sense be called representatives of the Conference. I should have had no choice therefore but to defer action, even if I had seen my own way clearly. But the whole matter seems to me to deserve more careful consideration. It is impossible not to respect the main objects of the promoters. The representation of lay opinion in the Church is a problem which cries for solution, and this Central Council is a rough attempt to solve it. But its constitution seems to me to be open to some question.

It is not a purely lay body, and indeed there are good reasons why clergy and laity should be combined for purposes of deliberation. But where the clerical element is given an equal representation with the lay, it must at least seem strange that the episcopate should be the only section of the Clergy which is wholly unrepresented. It is not enough to say that the Bishops have opportunities of meeting and consulting together elsewhere. The distinctive character of this Association is the opportunity of conferring with a representative lay body; and this opportunity the Bishops have not.

But, besides this difficulty of its constitution, there are others attending its action. The influence of such a body will necessarily be very great, and will increase in proportion as it becomes truly representative of opinion—more especially lay opinion—in the Church. But what will then be its relation to the two Convocations? What, if it should be found at cross purposes with them? I say nothing of any possible conflict with the Bishops, who are the chief administrators of the Church, though here the danger is perhaps equally great, because the voice of the Bishops would perforce be silent in the deliberations of the Council.

I do not wish to urge these considerations as final. But they do seem to me to be momentous. At all events I felt that entertaining these difficulties I could not commit the Diocese to a direct approval of the measure without first consulting my Conference. It

may appear advisable to risk some perils for the sake of a confessedly good object ; but further deliberation seemed advisable.¹²

(ii) *Diocesan Societies.*

The Diocesan Societies need not detain me long. They continue to do excellent work, of which the extent is only limited by their means. The division of the diocese involves a reconsideration of their position, and will probably lead in most cases to a corresponding separation. The *Society of the Sons of the Clergy* calls for one special remark. No institution seems to have more direct and urgent claims on the liberality of laymen than this. Yet I find that the clergy are by far the most numerous subscribers—frequently too, clergy with very slender incomes. In one Deanery there is only one layman out of thirteen ; in another twenty out of twenty-four subscribers are either clergymen or members of their families. The society receives very noble contributions from some few laymen, but the number of lay subscribers cannot amount to many more than one-third of the list. This same remark applies with at least equal force to another excellent institution—our *Diocesan Church Building Society*. Here again I am startled to find how large a proportion of the contributors are clergymen. I cannot believe that, if the matter were put definitely before them, the laity would allow this slur on their generosity in two important particulars to remain.

The *Diocesan Board of Inspection* continues to do excellent work. The progress made since the last visitation may be seen from a comparison of the statistics in the latest reports available on the two occasions :

	Schools Inspected.	Children Examined.	Pupil Teachers Examined.
1877	469	45,831	587
1881	494	56,788	658

In the present year it is estimated that 520 schools will have been examined. The quality of the work done has also improved from time to time, as will appear from the following table :

	Excellent.	Good.	Fair.	Moderate	Indifferent.	Bad.
1877	17	254	157	32	2	7
1881	35	284	156	17	2	0

The new experiment by which lectures prepared by the Inspectors have been delivered to Pupil Teachers at specified centres has, I trust, been found useful. My thanks are especially due to those clergy who at the cost of much time and trouble have assisted in carrying this scheme out.¹³

(iii) *Organization of Lay Help.*

Not the least important work of the Diocesan Conference was the appointment of a Committee to consider the Organization of Lay Help. In two

successive reports this committee placed its recommendations before me (*Diocesan Magazine*, February 1881, p. 18; March 1881, p. 34). These recommendations received my entire approval (*Diocesan Magazine*, April 1881, p. 50). They have been acted upon in some parishes, and I am able to say thankfully that they have given a great impulse to the sense of religious responsibility among the laity, and have been attended by a perceptible quickening of Church life. It is my earnest hope that the institution will spread, till every parish in the diocese has its organization. No diocese affords a better scope for this movement; none has more need of such aid to supplement its clerical ministrations.

The organization for individual parishes has yet to be followed up by a central organization for the whole diocese. This step however cannot well be taken until the local movements are farther advanced, and I therefore venture earnestly to press the subject on the attention of the clergy. By means of this central body, in which the parish organizations will be duly represented, I hope that the earnest laity of the diocese may be welded together into one whole, may feel the strength and the inspiration of numbers, may realize more fully the catholicity of their Church, and may thus throw themselves with renewed vigour and heightened courage into their work. I find that some misapprehension has been entertained with respect to this central organization. It is not intended in any way to supersede the Diocesan Conference; and care

will be taken that the functions of the two shall not clash. Its motive indeed will be quite different. It will interest itself solely with questions that concern workers as workers. It will promote the interchange of ideas between the representatives of different parishes on these questions. Thus it will give coherence to the work. I look forward also to general meetings from time to time when all the lay-helpers in the diocese will be invited to some great centre, such as Durham Cathedral, for devotional purposes. An anniversary religious festival, such as I contemplate, would be a great spur to the energies of individual workers and would teach all alike the lesson which we need to realize more fully—the unity of the body of which we severally are members.

(iv) *Lay Readers.*

At the head of this organization of lay help stands the office of the Lay Reader. The inability of the clergy to supply all the ministrations which are needed, is an acknowledged fact. The neglect of past generations has left us vast spiritual arrears to be overtaken. The population is increasing far more rapidly than the proportion of clergy. The difficulty, which is felt throughout the length and breadth of the English Church, is nowhere greater than in this diocese. There are very few parishes in Durham—they might be almost counted on the fingers—where the clergy however energetic are able to do all that ought to be done. If the Church has not succeeded in evangelizing

the masses, neither have the Nonconformists. What then shall we do? Shall we hang our hands in despair? Shall we be satisfied with going on as hitherto, picking up one here and one there, gathering together a more or less select congregation, forgetful meanwhile of the Master's command, "Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in." The Salvation Army has taught us a higher lesson than this. Whatever may be its faults, it has at least recalled us to this lost ideal of the work of the Church—the universal compulsion of the souls of men.

How shall we strive to realize this ideal? No accession to the ranks of the clergy, which can be contemplated as within the range of probability, would supply the need. But in the laity we have a recruiting ground of evangelists which, potentially at least, is inexhaustible. Shall we not avail ourselves of these resources? To enlist, to organize, to drill and marshall these volunteers of Christ's army, is the great work which lies before the Church of England in our generation. It is not difficult to see the great incidental gain in a movement in this direction on a large scale. The mere spectacle of a large body of laymen banded together for an evangelistic work, and giving their services gratuitously, raised above any suspicion of official prejudices or of personal interests—preaching Christ for Christ's sake—would have an incalculable moral effect. We have not yet thrown our energies, as a Church, into this organization. Even in the few dioceses where it has been seriously taken up, it has

not attracted attention at all in proportion to its importance. In this diocese the movement is still in its infancy. In January last I published my intention of issuing commissions to men recommended by the incumbents under whom they were prepared to work. The form of commission authorizes these Lay Readers 'to teach in the schools, to visit the sick, to read and explain the Scriptures, to exhort and pray in private households, to hold such services in unconsecrated buildings as the bishop shall approve, and generally to render aid to the incumbent in all ministrations which do not require the services of a minister in Holy Orders'; provided that nothing be 'done in the parish except at the request and with the consent of the said incumbent.' It is not expected that any individual Lay Reader shall perform all the functions here specified. This will depend on his gifts and his opportunities. But I was especially anxious to show a generous confidence in these lay ministrations. In some dioceses the preaching of the Lay Readers is confined to reading sermons approved by the Bishop or the incumbent. What may be the wisest course elsewhere I do not venture to say; but I felt—and I am sure the Clergy will feel with me—that in this diocese such a restriction would have been fatal to the efficiency of the scheme. The "liberty of prophesying" is nowhere more freely asserted or more highly valued than in these northern counties; and this new office would have been hopelessly crippled, if I had denied it this

function which is so freely exercised on all sides. My manifesto appeared eleven months ago. Commissions have been issued by me to 30 persons, of whom 9 belong to Northumberland and 21 still remain in the Diocese of Durham. Thus the progress of the measure has been somewhat slow. But this is not a subject of disappointment. Too great speed at first would not have augured well for its ultimate success; and already I see signs of accelerated progress. I look to the Clergy for their frank acceptance of the principle involved in this measure, and I believe that I shall not look in vain. The more we trust the laity, the more they will trust us.¹⁴

(v) *Ministration of Women.*

Another subject on which I feel strongly and which I commend to your earnest attention is the ministration of women. It has always been a matter of deep regret to me that in the received English Version of the Bible (which provisionally I will call Authorised) the female diaconate has been obliterated. As I read my New Testament, the female diaconate is as definite an institution in the Apostolic Church as the male diaconate. Phœbe is as much a deacon as Stephen or Philip is a deacon. Yet in the former of the two passages to which I have alluded (1 Tim. iii. 13), the deaconesses are transformed into deacons' wives in defiance alike of the natural interpretation of the words and of the suggestions of the context; while in the latter (Rom. xvi. 1) the colour-

less word "servant" is substituted for the more precise term "deacon" or "minister." Until this female ministry is restored, the Church of England in this diocese will remain one-handed.

Feeling this strongly, I laid the subject before the meeting of Archdeacons and Rural Deans in September, 1880. The result was the appointment of a committee on "Woman's Work," which reported early in the following year. This report recommended the introduction of the office of "deaconess" in the Diocese in accordance with rules approved by the two Archbishops and most of the Bishops some years ago; and it still further expressed the opinion that "an Institution for the Training of Deaconesses in the Diocese of Durham is in every way desirable" (*Diocesan Magazine*, March 1881, p. 35).

Our hands have been so full of late, that the working out of this scheme has been delayed hitherto; but I trust that it will occupy the serious attention of the Diocese forthwith, and that at the next visitation satisfactory progress will be reported. In no direction can the resources of the Church be developed with the hope of more immediate and abundant fruit. We may find some difficulty in defining the precise line where S. Paul's prohibition (1 Cor. xiv. 34), as interpreted in the light of other passages (1 Cor. xi. 5), fixes the limits of the woman's function as a religious teacher; but in the philanthropic and charitable work of the Church, which is her proper sphere, her capabilities are inexhaustible. To utilize

this great resource, hitherto undeveloped, to include within the organization and to endow with the blessing of the Church the latent potentialities of self-denying sympathy and love with which woman is so richly endowed—this will be a truly noble aim to set before our eyes. No witness of men will plead so eloquently for Christ as this silence of woman's inobtrusive but boundless charity.¹⁵

(vi) *Girls' Friendly Society and Young Men's Friendly Society.*

Two organizations especially demand our attention, as making provision for the care of the young of either sex. The *Girls' Friendly Society* was incorporated into our Diocesan Institutions in July, 1881. But, though so recently endowed with a diocesan organization, it has already taken firm root and is throwing out numerous and vigorous branches on all sides. In one or two Rural Deaneries more especially it has been worked with great activity and with very gratifying results. I feel sure that its worth needs only to be known in order to be appreciated; and I hope that before the next visitation branches will be established throughout the diocese. The work of this society is evangelical in the highest sense. But as it undertakes not only to befriend and guide young girls in their present locality, but also to accompany them in all their subsequent migrations with its sympathy and counsels, its efficiency must depend in no small degree on its universality. I trust therefore

before long to see such a net-work of its associations spread over the whole of this diocese that, whither-soever a girl may be removed, she may be sure of finding in her new home the same sisterly sympathy and guidance, on which she had learnt to depend in her former abode. This ought not to be difficult. There is, I am sure, in every neighbourhood no lack of warm-hearted Christian women who will esteem it a privilege to hold out a helping hand to their humble sisters, and will find in this interchange of sympathy their own truest and best reward. It has been represented to me that in some neighbourhoods the Girls Friendly Society cannot be worked at once honestly and efficiently. To meet such cases, which seem to be exceptional, the *Young Women's Help Society* has been established. In large and populous parishes there may be room for both ; but elsewhere probably confusion and perplexity would arise from the attempt to work both, and the choice will have to be made.

What the *Girls' Friendly Society* aims at doing for the one sex, the *Young Men's Friendly Society* undertakes to do for the other. This association was founded later than the other, and has not yet made such progress ; but it is hardly less needed. You probably have in your own parishes some organization or other for bringing youths together, for binding them to the Church and to one another, and for guiding them at the most critical season of their life—either Church Institutes or Mutual Improvement Associations or Parish Guilds or the like. But a

Central Association like the *Young Men's Friendly Society* is needed as a bond of union between these local associations, so that, as in the case of the girls, a youth passing from one neighbourhood to another may feel that a friendly eye follows him. The affiliation therefore of your parochial associations, whatever name they may bear, with this parent society, is an object which I recommend to your attention. I trust that before long we may have some more complete diocesan organization for this society than we have at present.

I have mentioned it as a chief aim of both these societies that they strive to keep an eye on young persons, so that once taken up they may never be lost sight of. May I venture for a moment to dwell on the importance of thus realizing the catholicity of our Church in our dealings with young and old alike? Early in the year I issued a form of *Commendatory Letter*, which I hoped would be used by the Clergy in cases of migration from their parishes, whether to some other part of England or to the Colonies. I am glad to find from the visitation returns that there are very few of the Clergy who do not either use this form or adopt other measures having the same end in view.¹⁶

(vii) *Diocesan Preachers.*

It has become somewhat the fashion in these days to speak disparagingly of the parochial system, as if

it were a failure. I have no sympathy with this language. The parochial system is the great safeguard of any Church, without which it would be in peril of degenerating into mere congregationalism. In rural districts it is probably as efficient as it ever has been. In the more populous places on the other hand, and especially in the densely crowded towns, it is often sorely taxed; but just here, where the strain is greatest, the need for its maintenance is also the most urgent. The lowest parts of our great towns have little else but the parochial system to look to; and if their spiritual needs are not supplied thence, they are in imminent peril of being altogether neglected. The Nonconformist chapel is dependent on the Nonconformist congregation. As the district sinks lower in the social scale, the members of the Nonconformist congregation migrate to a better neighbourhood, and the chapel is compelled to follow their migration. If the Church of England is wakeful and active in that neighbourhood, it will see a necessity laid upon it by the opportunity, and will step in and fill the vacancy thus created. In the borough of Sunderland alone, since I came into the diocese, not less than four Nonconformist chapels, thus abandoned, have been purchased by the Church of England, and utilized for her services in the poorer parts of the town.

But a due appreciation of the parochial system is one thing; a blind idolatry of it is another. Plainly it has not succeeded, and there is no ground for hope

that it will succeed, if unaided, in evangelizing the masses. The demand therefore is imperative that we should consider how we can best supplement its agency with a view to greater efficiency. And here our eyes turn instinctively in one direction. The prominent place which mission preaching has assumed in the Church of England within a very few years is not the least remarkable fruit of the great spiritual revival. It becomes us therefore to enquire whether by some definite diocesan organization we cannot help this movement forward. The main lines of such an organization will probably have presented themselves, as obvious, to most of you. At the head will be a member of the Cathedral Chapter, a Canon Missioner in effect, if not in name. If the idea which has suggested itself to many should ever take effect, and a Minor Canonry in the Cathedral should be assigned to the endowment of a mission preachership, we should thus have provision for a lieutenant acting with and under the Canon Missioner. With this nucleus ready to hand, the creation of an adequate staff of Diocesan Preachers ought not to be a far distant event. The organization of this staff, the consideration of ways and means, the regulation of the special missions, and above all the provision for the spiritual sustenance of the missionaries, would be the work of the Canon, who himself also would undertake part of the preaching. The staff might comprise, if it were thought fit, laity as well as clergy, unpaid as well as paid agents, the temporary aid of those engaged in parochial work as

well as the continuous services of those specially and solely devoted to this mission work. Care would be taken not to repeat the mistake of the preaching friars in the thirteenth and following centuries. No body of men would be set up as rivals to the parochial clergy. No parish would be invaded except at the invitation or with the consent of the incumbent.

In this way the institution would be worked as a spiritual refreshment both to clergy and to people. The successful parochial organizer and visitor is not always the best preacher. Even when the parish clergyman has this gift, a new voice will often strike a chord in hearts where the tones long familiar have failed to awaken any response. Meanwhile to an incumbent, working on from year's end to year's end within the limits of his own district, it will be a relief for the moment to become a hearer. He will resume his work with new ideas, new aspirations, new impulses, new encouragements, through the stimulus thus given to the spiritual life of the parish.

3. MISCELLANEOUS.

(i) *Ordinations.*

The statistics of the Ordinations will necessarily be a subject of great interest to all here. It is well known that—for reasons which I have explained elsewhere—I restored the summer Ordination, which in this diocese was customarily held at the end of June or the beginning of July, to the proper Ember season. But while doing this, I added another Ordination at

September for deacons only—partly for the general convenience of the diocese, and partly also to meet the cases of those Durham students who would not have passed their University Examination before Trinity Sunday. This change however was not made during 1879, so that it has only been in operation for three out of the four years.

In his last charge (1878) Bishop Baring congratulated the diocese on the gradual increase in the number of deacons ordained for the diocese. In the previous four years (1871-1874) the number had been 90, "a larger number than any recorded in any former period of the same length," but in the four years preceding this last Visitation (1875-1878) it had risen to 119, an average of nearly 30 each year. I am glad to be able to announce a still further increase. The number ordained during the last four years will be 134, an average of between 33 and 34 each year. Of these 107 have been ordained during the last three years, since the new system was introduced, giving an average of nearly 36 each year. But the last two Ordinations of the present year have taken place since the reduction of the diocese. The gain is therefore greater than it seems, and the candidates to be ordained this Advent by the Bishop of Newcastle, ought to be added to the numbers given in order to estimate the increase. Moreover there is other ground for satisfaction. The proportion of deacons from the older universities, Oxford and Cambridge, in the four years preceding the last Visitation was as nearly as

possible one-fifth of the whole number. During the last four years 68 out of 134, and during the last three years 60 out of 107, have been Oxford or Cambridge men. This result has not been purchased, I am glad to say, by a sacrifice of members of Durham University, whether graduates or licentiates, as the proportion of these has not very materially altered.¹⁷

(ii) *Meeting of Curates.*

The mention of the newly ordained leads me by a natural transition to speak of another subject. It had long been my desire to gather together from time to time the younger clergy of the diocese for mutual conference and common devotion. The reduction of the diocese by the formation of the See of Newcastle enabled me to realize this desire. The clergy who had been ordained by myself and are still holding curacies in the reduced Diocese of Durham were invited to Auckland for a portion of two days. Though the arrangements were unavoidably made at a late date, so that only short notice could be given, as many as 70 of the younger clergy accepted the invitation. A Greek Testament reading, a celebration of the Holy Communion, chapel services with addresses, a conference on a subject of pastoral interest, formed the programme of the proceedings. I have reason to think that the opportunity was appreciated by those present, and I look forward to a recurrence of such meetings.

(iii) Confirmations.

With the present year I inaugurated a new scheme for the distribution of the Confirmation centres. It is framed on the plan that every parish shall have a Confirmation in its proper centre once in two years, while in the alternate year candidates can be taken to a second centre which, though not so near, shall not be inconveniently distant. In all the large towns there is a Confirmation in one or other of the churches every year.

I find that my intention has been misunderstood. It has been supposed in some quarters that I wished to discourage the presentation of candidates in the alternate years at the second centres, and that I was only providing for stray and exceptional cases. This is the reverse of my motive. My ideal of the working of a parish is a regular system of classes of instruction, which shall lead up to the Confirmation class. Thus the preparation for Confirmation would be going on during some portion at least of every year; and the annual presentation of candidates would follow as a matter of course. It was mainly in order to make the realization of this system possible, that the plan of double centres was devised. I put this forward as the ideal; but I have no desire to press it on the incumbents of parishes. It may be felt in many cases that the clerical strength at their disposal, being limited, may be better employed in some other way. To their discretion therefore I leave it.

By this new arrangement the number of centres and the frequency of Confirmations in any given locality has been largely increased. If it should be thought advisable still further to increase the centres, I am prepared to consider alterations in the scheme with this view. But, independently of the Bishop's convenience, there are other considerations which suggest a limit to the number of centres. A Confirmation in every parish commends itself to some as the goal of their aspirations. Even if this were possible, it does not seem to me advisable. It might ensure a few more candidates, though probably not many more. It would have the further advantage that the friends and relations of the persons confirmed could be able to attend in larger numbers. But it would entail one very real loss. The gathering together of candidates from several parishes into one central church enlarges and strengthens their conceptions of Church membership; and as such opportunities are very few, we could not without regret forego the most important of these.

The large increase in the number of persons confirmed is a matter for unfeigned thankfulness. I know no better standard by which the progress of the work of the Church can be measured than this. In the four years ending 1878 the number confirmed was 17,502; in the four years ending 1882 it has mounted to 25,815, thus exhibiting an increase of more than 45 per cent. But the numbers are still far short of the standard at which we should aim. The proportion

of males to females is higher than in most dioceses, being roughly as two to three.¹⁸

(iv) *Church Building and Restoration.*

The work of Church Building has been going on vigorously in the diocese during the last four years, notwithstanding the financial depression. During this period eighteen churches have been consecrated. The work of Church Restoration also has gone forward on a large scale. From the Visitation returns I find that in the County of Durham alone seven Churches have been restored or enlarged, or both, at an expenditure ranging between £5,000 and £3,000 upon each; while on as many others sums ranging between £2,000 and £1,000 have been expended. The total sum spent in this county on Churches, Mission Chapels, Parsonage Houses, Sunday and Day Schools, etc., as these returns show, amounts to not less than £155,000.

At an earlier point in this charge I spoke about the impending formation of new parishes. But a new parish requires a new church. On this account alone therefore the necessity of very extensive building operations confronts us. But we have still arrears to make up. In Gateshead alone three churches at least should be built without delay—to meet the wants of existing parishes. Some special effort therefore must be made to supplement local resources. Either a very large addition must be made to the resources of our

Diocesan Church Building Society, or a special fund must be started to meet the special emergency.

Among the objects on which money had been expended, I mentioned Mission Chapels. There are already, so far as I can make out from the returns, which probably are not complete in this respect, not fewer than 118 Chapels of Ease or Mission Chapels or other rooms (in addition to the Parish Churches), where Divine Service according to the rites of the Church of England is regularly held, in the reduced diocese of Durham. This gives an average of more than one to every two parishes. From the general character of our parishes, and the distribution of the population, we may expect that the number of these subsidiary places of worship will considerably increase—this being the most efficient way of working a large and scattered parish. It is therefore proposed to supplement our Diocesan Church Building Fund by a separate Mission Chapel Fund, and I heartily commend this object to the liberality of Churchmen.¹⁹

(v) *Diocesan Calendar and Magazine.*

The Diocesan Calendar has now been in existence several years; the Diocesan Magazine was started in the beginning of 1881. I wish especially to call the attention of the Clergy to the valuable services which they may render to both these publications. The editorship is a laborious, unremunerative, and thankless office. The editor therefore deserves the gratitude of us all. It rests with the clergy to lighten his

labours by supplying him with full and accurate information. I hear some complaints that the Diocesan Magazine is largely made up of information which has appeared already in the daily newspapers. This repetition is inevitable. I do not see how it can be otherwise unless the Magazine is to forfeit its proper character as a continuous record of work done in the diocese. But it is not unreasonable to ask the local clergy to transmit to the editor at an early date corrected reports of events happening in their parishes, so that he shall not be altogether dependent on the daily Press. There is one other point also to which I wish to advert in connexion with the Magazine. I had hoped that within the limits of the diocese it might take the place of a clerical agency. If all incumbents who have curacies vacant would notify the fact to the editor, this end would be in some measure accomplished. Hitherto the notifications seem to have been somewhat irregularly made.

4. *RETROSPECTIVE AND PROSPECTIVE.*

The retrospect of four years cannot fail under any circumstances to suggest many sad and solemnizing thoughts. The interval which has elapsed since the last Visitation has been marked by exceptionally heavy losses to this diocese. The last words of his Visitation charge had scarcely died away on your ears, when your Diocesan announced his intention of resigning the office which he had so long discharged with unswerving assiduity and singleness of

purpose—to recruit his health, as his friends hoped, and to spend his last years peacefully in a quiet home, relieved from the cares of a burdensome and anxious office—to render up his spirit, as the event proved, to God who gave it, and to enter at once into the fruition of a deeper and more abiding peace. In the Cathedral Chapter too the losses of these four years have been exceptionally great. The stalls attached to the two Archdeaconries have been vacated by death. By the death of the one Archdeacon we lost a cherished link with the past—the courtly, kindly, stately gentleman—true type of the nobler Churchmanship of his generation. After a long career of active public service and diffusive private benevolence, he was taken away—his full term of years outlived and his allotted task accomplished. The other was carried off suddenly only the other day in the prime of an energetic and vigorous life. His calm judgment, his wide experience, his placid temper, his moderating influence, his great business capacities, were placed freely at the service of all in this diocese. His departure has left a blank, which will long be felt, in your counsels and in mine. One other member too of the Capitular body, venerable in years and character, if not venerable by title—John Davie Eade—an earnest parochial minister and an active diocesan administrator, has passed away amidst the affectionate regrets of all. Among the parish clergy also the obituary has been large—too large for mention in detail. Some have faded slowly and

silently away in extreme old age ; with others the thread of life was suddenly snapped in the noonday of their usefulness and their vigour.²⁰ In the ranks of laymen too, who have rendered conspicuous service to the Church, we are conscious of some serious gaps. Of all those whose loss we deplore it would be impossible to make mention. But the signal munificence of John and Edward Joicey—*par nobile fratrum*—claims the tribute of our grateful remembrance. Too soon for us they have gone to their rest ; but generations yet unborn will reap in temporal and spiritual blessings the fruits of their large hearts and their open hands. One other name too claims a special mention in this County and Diocese. George second Earl of Durham died in the prime of life. In his great influence and wealth he recognized a responsible trust, a sacred stewardship. The last time that I met him—a few months before his death—was on the occasion of the consecration of a church—the second which had been built by his sole munificence.

Men come and men go ; but the stream of Church life flows ceaselessly on, to lose itself at length in the ocean of eternity. We count our losses irreparable, but God repairs them. Volunteers start up to fill the vacant places. The line is unbroken still, and the army marches forward to do battle with the enemies of the Israel of God.

Two exceptional events have occurred since the last Visitation, which I cannot pass over without notice. The first is the Newcastle Church Congress ; the second

the Jubilee of Durham University. The meetings of the Congress are still fresh in our memories after the lapse of more than a twelvemonth. It has not passed away, I am sure, without bequeathing to us a valuable inheritance in enlarged hopes, heightened ideals, stronger and wider sympathies, a truer realization of our duties and opportunities, and a fuller sense of our privileges as members of the Church of Christ. The Jubilee of our Northern University again is an occurrence of no small significance. At once the seal of past achievements and the pledge of future vitality, it will have a deep interest for a diocese which draws so large a proportion of its clergy from this recruiting ground.

The last four years indeed have had their full tale of calamities. Seaham and Trimdon, Tudhoe and Stanley, are names which will suggest many sad reminiscences. Catastrophes on this large scale cannot fail to tell appreciably upon the work of the Church. The cloud of commercial depression moreover has only gradually been dispelled. The succession of disastrous harvests too has affected these parts, though in the county of Durham at least the agricultural interests at stake are not so considerable as in many parts. With all these drawbacks it is a matter for deep thankfulness that the work of the Church has advanced steadily and appreciably.

We have indeed been confronted with statistics of Church attendance at some of our populous centres which tell no flattering tale. It were to be desired

that a religious census, if taken at all, should be taken by proper authorities. Private undertakings, however honestly they may be conducted, must necessarily fail in accuracy. They are instituted by particular persons with special ends in view; and such persons will naturally have access to fuller information in some quarters than in others. As regards Church attendance, there is good reason to believe that those complementary services which now occupy so prominent a place in the work of the Church of England—early communions, mission-room services, children's school-room services, and the like, and which if recorded would have swelled the numbers largely—have been altogether, or almost altogether overlooked, even where more important omissions have not been made. In the most populous centre in which these statistics have been taken, and probably elsewhere, there is good reason to believe that the recent quickening of Church life has very considerably increased the aggregate attendance on Sundays. At all events, wherever authoritative and trustworthy information is attainable—as for instance in the registers of marriages or funerals, or in the statistics of the army or navy or of workhouses or of other public institutions, or in the contributions to philanthropic purposes such as hospitals, or in the expenditure on elementary schools—the position of the Church of England in point of numbers and influence appears strikingly at variance with the results suggested by these statistics.²¹

But after every allowance made for errors, one sad fact remains—a fact which all would do well to ponder—that great masses of our people are living practically without God in the world, untouched alike by the ministrations of the Church clergy and of Nonconformist ministers. Well would it be for England, well for the Church of Christ in this land, if each religious body would do its own work, earnestly, peacefully, devotedly—content to spend on enlightening the souls and reclaiming the lives of men the energy which too often is exhausted in religious and political warfare. “All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword”—the sword whether of sectarian polemics or of political rancour. There may be no slight provocation, when a weapon is at hand, to use it; but the Master’s warning voice to His disciples is still the same, “Put up thy sword into the sheath.” The polemical temper is its own judge and its own executioner. Whensoever religion degenerates into politics—whether in Church or sect, whether in minister or congregation—its fate is sealed. The Spirit is grieved, is quenched; and only the lifeless body of religion remains.

From the retrospect we turn to the prospect. The achievements in the past may be allowed to inspire the hopes for the future. The four years just elapsed have been largely occupied in organization and re-arrangement. This work is not yet completed. In a diocese like Durham, where the population increases so rapidly, anything like finality in the external arrangements is

beyond hope. Ever fresh modifications and enlargements will be necessary to meet the growing and changing wants. But the four years to come will properly be spent much more in completing existing arrangements, in working upon lines already laid down, and in vivifying the external organizations which have been created. The machinery of dioceses, of archdeaconries and deaneries, of parishes, of ministries and associations, is a dead, inert, unproductive thing if the motive power be wanting. And this motive power can come only from one source. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh"—the external mechanism, the formal organization—"profiteth nothing. The words that I speak to you—they are Spirit, and they are life." If this voice of Christ be silent in our hearts, then it is all lost labour that we perfect our ecclesiastical machinery. This machinery is a good conductor of spiritual energy, but the energy itself it cannot create. The fiery baptism of the Spirit may not be replaced by any visible or tangible invention of man.

Our difficulties no doubt are great. The spiritual arrears bequeathed by past generations are enormous. The special perplexities and aberrations of our own age—intellectual and social—are not few. But I should be faithless if I spoke any other language to-day than the language of hope. Where so many bright experiences have been vouchsafed in the past, no place is left for despair as to the future. Have I not seen, not once or twice only, a parish which had

long lain a spiritual wilderness, a proverb and byword to the foes of the Church, suddenly quickened into fresh and vigorous life under a new incumbent or curate in charge, attracting and inspiring fellow-labourers by his zeal and self-denial? Have I not found men willing, at their Bishop's summons, to forego an adequate and assured competency, and to labour in some unpromising and arduous field on a bare curate's stipend, with an uncertain future before them, because they regarded the summons as a call from God, thus shaming my own faint heart by the strength of their faith? Does not the history of the Newcastle Bishopric Fund—the liberal donations of the many, the princely munificence of the few—read a lesson full of encouragement and hope? Are not the Confirmation returns—manifesting a large and sudden increase in the numbers presented—a truly inspiring fact? Seeing all these things, can we do otherwise than bow our heads in thanksgiving and cry from the fulness of an overflowing heart, “Yea, the Lord hath done great things for us already, whereof we rejoice;” “Wilt not Thou, O God, go forth with our hosts?”; “Through God will we do great acts; for it is He that shall tread down our enemies”—our enemies, because His enemies.

II.

The Church.

The former part of my charge was occupied wholly with matters relating to the diocese. I purpose now to discuss questions which have a wider interest. In some cases these affect us directly in the same way as they affect the whole Church. In others we have no immediate practical interest in them; but yet we cannot thrust them aside. The diocese is a part of a larger body, and the suffering of any one member must soon or late involve the suffering of all. To this latter class of subjects belongs the dispute about vestments. The ritual difficulty, I am thankful to say, is unknown among us; and I trust that it will always so remain. But we cannot ignore it.

1.

The Burial Laws Amendment Act.

The most important recent Act of the Legislature affecting the Church has been the Burials Act of 1880. My vote was given in favour of the measure, and I have seen no cause since to regret it. I could never indeed acknowledge that it was required as a matter of justice, but it seemed to me to be a wise and

generous concession to a widespread sentiment which deserved to be treated with all respect. Any wrangling over the open grave is abhorrent to our feelings, and it is vain at such times to expect men to be ruled solely and absolutely by considerations of strict justice. No more disadvantageous ground could have been chosen for fighting the battle of the Church. It would have been highly perilous to her health to have kept open this running sore any longer. The minor provisions of the Act indeed went beyond the requirements of either justice or sentiment, and I voted against some of these. But it was contended by the promoters of the Bill that, while giving, it was well to give ungrudgingly. To some of its opponents a main ground of objection was the fear that the treatment of the churchyards would form a precedent for the treatment of the churches. If this had been so, the Bill would have met with the most determined opposition from a very large number of those who supported it. But Ministers of the Crown and other chief promoters of the measure, in both Houses, not only disclaimed any such motive in their own minds, but emphatically denied any analogy between the two cases.

The passing of this Act, among other important questions, involved an immediate decision on one point. The Act threw open consecrated as well as unconsecrated ground to other rites of Christian burial besides those of the Church of England. It became a question therefore whether henceforward cemeteries

and additions to churchyards should continue to be consecrated as hitherto or not. This appeared to me to be a matter on which—though I had my own opinion—I ought not to act without ascertaining the general sentiment of those more directly affected. The value of such consecration seemed to me to depend on the extent to which it was upheld by the sentiment of the clergy and laity of the Church of England in the diocese. I therefore laid the matter before the Archdeacons and Rural Deans at our annual meeting at Auckland Castle. This was happily an exceptionally full meeting, and I was glad to find that without a single dissentient voice those present pronounced in favour of the continuance of the ancient practice. With much satisfaction I learnt afterwards that this was also the opinion of the great body of the English episcopate. For those indeed who were unable to regard the Consecration Service otherwise than as a dedication restricting the ground to the rites of the Church of England, it was impossible to take this view. In this case such a service could only be a self-stultification. But this was not my own view; and I have therefore continued to consecrate when invited by the proper authorities and assured of the proper safeguards. The Act directly provides that the rites shall be a ‘Christian and orderly religious service,’ and expressly condemns the attempt at funerals conducted under its provisions ‘to bring into contempt or obloquy the Christian religion, or the belief or worship of any Church or denomination of

Christians.' This guarantee seemed to justify the dedication of ground which, though henceforth not exclusively, yet principally would be devoted to the burial rites of the Church of England, by a solemn form of prayer.

But another question arises under the new Act. A clergyman may be invited to perform a funeral in unconsecrated ground. What is to be done under these circumstances? Is the grave to be specially dedicated or not? Looking at the Consecration Service of a churchyard as a setting apart of the ground and separating it from profane and unhallowed uses for a special purpose, I do not (where this is found impossible) see sufficient reason for the special consecration of individual graves. In such cases I should be content to regard the burial service itself as an adequate dedication. For this reason I have not authorized any form for the consecration of graves. There can indeed be no objection in principle to the use of any edifying form of prayer in such cases, where a clergyman desires it. Only I conceive that it cannot be made part of the Burial Service itself, because neither under the Act itself nor elsewhere is he authorized to use in funeral rites any form of words but 'prayers taken from the Book of Common Prayer and portions of Holy Scripture', and these only as 'prescribed or approved of by the Ordinary.' I fear also that such a practice might be misunderstood, and therefore I should not wish to encourage it.

It will be a matter of great interest to the clergy to learn what has been the working of the Act in this diocese. As the presbyterian element in our population is disproportionately great owing to our proximity to the Scottish border, as our mining and industrial centres comprise a very large number of Roman Catholics, and as Nonconformity of various kinds is exceptionally active and powerful, it has probably nowhere been put to so severe a test as in this diocese. It is therefore with great satisfaction that I give you the results, as they appear in the Visitation returns. Full and correct returns have been made of 111 Consecrated Churchyards. The total number of funerals in these since the passing of the Act amounts to 12,823. Of this number 521 only have been taken by others besides clergy of the Church of England—making a proportion of about 4 per cent. The great majority of these however are Roman Catholic funerals. In 12 only out of the 111 parishes is a separation made in the returns between funerals taken by Roman Catholic priests and those taken by Nonconformist ministers and others not being clergy of our Church. The number of Roman Catholic funerals in these parishes is 213; the number of other dissenting funerals only 54; so that in the aggregate the Roman Catholic funerals amount to nearly four fifths of the whole. It would not however be safe to draw any general inference from this fact, as these were probably places which contain an exceptionally large Roman Catholic population. Of

the 111 consecrated churchyards of which I have returns, I find that in 47 there were no funerals except according to the rites of the Church of England; in 17 others there was only one; and in 7 others again there were only two. These statistics tell their own tale. But different inferences will be drawn from them respecting the Act itself. To some they will appear to show that it was unnecessary and therefore ought not to have been passed; to others that the objections against it have proved groundless, and that it is justified by the event. For myself I feel that a grievance—a sentimental grievance if you will, but not the less real on that account—has been removed by the Act; that the results have shown how firm a hold the rites of the Church of England have on the affections of the people at the most solemn moments; and that in all ways our position is stronger for the concession.

But there is also another side to the Act. It not only made concessions to the dissenters, but also afforded relief to the clergy. The necessity of reading the whole of the Burial Service over every one—even the most profligate—with certain specified exceptions was a grievous burden to the conscience; the prohibition against reading any part of it in these exceptional cases was sometimes, as for instance over unbaptized persons, a painful disability. An alternative service, framed in accordance with the provisions of the Act, and approved by a large number of the Bishops, has been provided. Giving a choice of

psalms, lessons, and collects, it is sufficiently flexible to meet all cases. I have authorized its use for my diocese (*Diocesan Magazine*, August 1881, p. 118 sq.); and I find that it has been employed in several instances. These have not been very numerous, and it is not desirable that they should be so; but the advantage of having such an alternative service to fall back upon has obviously been felt by the clergy in these cases.

The Act therefore has worked smoothly in this diocese. The fears which many entertained have not been justified. There has been no burial scandal among us which can fairly be traced to the Act. But while saying this I wish to give honour where honour is due. This peaceful result is owing mainly to the loyal acceptance by the parochial clergy of a measure which was most distasteful to a large number of them, and which might have led to serious consequences if they had shown a different temper. But they have postponed their own private feelings to the peace of the Church, and they have had and will have their reward.²²

2.

Permanent Diaconate.

A measure for supplying the existing defects of our ministerial agency which attracts great and increasing favour is the establishment of a *permanent diaconate*. I wish I could myself contemplate such a measure with the unmixed satisfaction and the absence of misgiving which its champions manifest. It is proposed that

persons either possessing private means or engaged in trade or business or exercising a profession should be admitted to this order, without relinquishing their secular avocations; that they should, if necessary, receive a small stipend to supplement their means of livelihood gained in other ways, though some might be prepared to give their services gratuitously; that they should enter upon the office without any intention or prospect of being advanced to the higher order of the priesthood; and that (as a consequence) the intellectual and educational standard of admission to the diaconate should be lowered—the severer examination, in which alone a knowledge of the learned languages would be required, being reserved for the candidates for Priests' orders.

Against this measure I have no objection to urge on principle. I do not see how I can find fault with the pursuit of secular avocations in the ministers of a Church whose chief Apostle was a tent-maker. Precedents too in later ages are sufficiently frequent to justify this combination of the spiritual office with the secular work. Nor again can I interpret the 'good degree' of 1 Tim. iii. 13 in any such way as to imply that the promotion of deacons to the higher office ought to be the rule in the Church of Christ. The laws of our own branch of the Church do indeed present some difficulties, but these might be overcome. The Statute (1 and 2 Vict. c. 106, sect. 27), which forbids spiritual persons holding office in the Church to engage in business or trade, might perhaps be

liberally interpreted so as to allow professional men, still exercising their profession, to take Holy Orders; and it certainly does not exclude persons of means, who do not earn their bread in any of these ways. Neither again are the prohibitions in the Canons a formidable obstacle. The 75th Canon only forbids 'any base or servile labour'; and the 76th Canon merely orders that any person admitted priest or deacon shall not 'afterwards use himself in the course of his life as a layman'—a vague expression and capable of being so interpreted as to cover the measure in question. A more stubborn ecclesiastical barrier is the office for the Ordering of Deacons in the Prayer Book, which both in the prayer for the newly ordained and in the final rubric contemplates their proceeding within a reasonably short interval to the higher order. Yet even this might be taken to express the normal practice, to which exceptions might be freely made.

But, waiving these questions of ecclesiastical law, of which the solution perhaps would not be very difficult, I foresee the possibility of grave administrative complications arising out of the creation of such a diaconate. It is intended, I suppose, that the orders of these deacons should be regarded as indelible. A deacon once created is a deacon for life in the eye of the Church. He is permanently resident in the parish where he is called to minister. Not improbably he is tied to it by his business avocations. Thus he establishes a position of influence by his

personal relations and his continuous abode in the parish. If he has ability and eloquence, his power will be very considerable. He will gather about him a large circle of friends and admirers. Moreover he will receive a stipend which, though not very large, is a consideration to him; and he would feel aggrieved if it ceased without his own free will. But the incumbent changes from time to time; and it is not difficult to see that complications may arise from this fact. The removal of a deacon from his ministrations may set a whole parish on fire. The case of a curate presents no analogy, because he has not as a rule any domestic ties in the place and he speedily departs to some other sphere of labour without serious inconvenience to himself. But a permanent deacon would remain as a focus of disaffection, if the elements of disaffection were there. The weight of parochial influence in fact has been transferred from the chief officer to his subordinate. The centre of gravity has thereby been removed to a dangerous position, and the parish is kept in a state of unstable equilibrium. Meanwhile the deacon himself has a right to feel dissatisfied. He is invested with an office which he cannot shake off; and yet he is not allowed to perform the functions or to reap the advantages of his office.

Incidentally also, there is another serious difficulty which strikes forcibly, perhaps too forcibly, one who has himself been an examining chaplain for seventeen years. The promoters of this measure contemplate making

the examination for Priests' Orders the really searching intellectual test. But experience shows that it is impossible to enforce a higher standard in this second examination than in the earlier. The candidate for Deacons' Orders during his preparation could at least call his time his own; but the interval between the first and the second ordination is engrossed with parochial work. Hence, so far as my experience goes, it is the exception rather than the rule, when a man passes a more satisfactory examination for Priests' than for Deacons' Orders. In those parts of the examination in which his practical experience tells, he will be found to have made an advance; but where his intellectual acquisitions are tested, his answers will be less satisfactory than they were before.

But, it will be said, this scheme for a permanent diaconate is after all only a restoration of the normal practice in the primitive Church; and we cannot do wrong if we follow this practice with an implicit faith as to the results. My answer is this. If you would remodel the Church organization after the primitive type, you must do so in all respects. It will not answer to take one piece out of a complex organization, expecting that it will work in the same way, though the mechanism connected with it is quite different. If the diaconate in the primitive Church was permanent and localized, so was the presbyterate. If the primitive deacons maintained themselves by plying their trade or their business, so did the primitive priests. Moreover the presbyteral office

was commonly represented by a body of men (a presbytery) not by a single individual, and thus it commanded the influence of numbers. There was therefore no danger of the result which I apprehend under present conditions—the transference of the centre of gravity to a position imperilling the stability of a church.

I bring forward these considerations, not because I wish to regard them as conclusive, though to my own mind they are very serious; but because I desire to direct attention to them. But there is yet another question which we may pertinently ask. Even if the legal difficulties were overcome, even if the practical objections were overruled, would this creation of a permanent diaconate do all or nearly all that we want?

I do not think it would. There would be a certain relief as regards the actual ministrations within the Church, but these are very far from constituting the main part of an active incumbent's duties; and, if the relief were given in other directions, the pressure of these would be less felt. But for mission services, for cottage lectures, for teaching in the schools, for visiting the sick, and *a fortiori* for other less spiritual functions than these, such as keeping accounts and the like, lay agency would probably be found as effective and would be far more largely available. The curate, though only in deacon's orders is much more valuable now to the incumbent than the layman, because spiritual ministrations are the main business

of his life. But as soon as they cease to be this—as they would cease with these semi-secular deacons—it is reduced to a question of degree. Meanwhile the loss is serious. The most competent and conscientious laymen would probably object to being invested with a ministerial office which, involving grave responsibilities, would cling to them for life, no matter what may be the change in their external circumstances. Thus the field of choice would be limited. Meanwhile, if adopted as a substitute for the Lay Readership of which I spoke in a former part of my charge—and this seems the view entertained by many of its supporters—it would involve another serious loss. The value of the Lay Reader's ministrations will consist to a large extent in the twofold fact that they are gratuitous and that they are not clerical. The one advantage probably, the other certainly, would be forfeited by the adoption of the Permanent Diaconate instead.²³

3.

The Salvation Army.

A new and complex problem has been offered to the Church of England since the last Visitation. A remarkable organization for evangelizing the masses has sprung up suddenly into maturity and is invading all our towns and many of our more populous villages. It has thrown out branches into our colonies, into our Indian dependency, into America, even into the nations of continental Europe.

The Salvation Army has now been in existence for

seventeen years ; but its most rapid strides have been made within the last four or five years. During this time it seems to have advanced with ever accelerated pace. It has occupied a prominent place in Episcopal Charges, in Diocesan Conferences, in Church Congresses, in platform speeches, in review articles, in all those various instrumentalities through which the Church makes her voice heard. A Bishop, addressing his Clergy at such a moment, could not, even if he had the wish, be silent about an organization which seems to be fraught with such important issues whether for good or for evil, and towards which the attitude of the Church of England cannot be a matter of indifference.

The leading characteristic of this organization is from one point of view its great recommendation. It emphatically disclaims the intention of setting up a new sect. 'We are not and will not be made a Church,' say the *Orders and Regulations* in explicit terms (p. 4). It is intended, in the language of its General, to 'leave to the Churches all who wish mere Church life' (*Contemporary Review*, August 1882, p. 181). Thus, as an organization, it stands outside all the Churches, while any individual member may belong to any community which he prefers. This feature makes it easy to deal with, at least in theory. What may be the practical difference, I shall consider hereafter. But it has stood the Army in good stead ; 'By these means,' writes its chief officer, 'we have certainly attained already a most friendly footing in

relation to all Churches in many localities,' and he expresses the hope that before long they will have spread far and wide a spirit 'of love and hearty co-operation that will do much to lessen the dividing walls of sectarianism' (*ib.* pp. 181, 182).

I wish before all things not to stint my praise, where praise is due. The Salvation Army has many valuable lessons to teach us, if only we will consent to learn them. First and foremost I place the ideal of evangelistic work, to which I have referred in a former part of my charge. The high-handed faith which refuses to believe that the Gospel was intended for the few, the magnificent courage which attacks not individuals or families, but whole towns and whole neighbourhoods—this twofold protest, both doctrinal and practical, against all narrowness ought surely to command our warmest admiration. Again the stress which is laid on the Fatherly Love of God, as the central idea of the Incarnation and the Gospel message, exalts and spiritualizes its dogmatic teaching. So too its persistent protest against antinomianism distinguishes it favourably from other forms of revivalism to which it bears external resemblances. Whatever may be its extravagances or its shortcomings, it aims at a distinct moral reform in its converts.

Nor again can its successes be denied. The character of the movement indeed seems to vary much in different localities with the officers in command. Hence the very divergent opinions which are formed by men equally unprejudiced. If I were

justified in estimating the movement as a whole from the partial facts which have come within my own cognizance, I should certainly place it higher than it is placed by others whose larger experience I respect, or than the extravagance of its own organs would suggest. But anyhow its effects speak for themselves. If it had done nothing else, it would have achieved a notable triumph in reclaiming so many thousands of drunkards in the name of Christ.

The Salvationists claim our respect also from the hostility which they have provoked. We cannot but regard it as an honourable distinction that they have been exposed to attacks from the lowest and most degraded rabble of our towns. If this hostility has been elicited in some measure by their flaunting attitude, it has had its roots in the consciousness that the strongholds of vice were endangered by their assaults.

But if its achievements are notable, so also have been and are its faults. I do not class among these the name which it has adopted. The title *Salvation Army*, besides suggesting the peculiar character of the organization, is a great moral parable to its members. Nor again have we any right to complain of its craving after notoriety. To get into the newspapers, to keep themselves before the public, to cover the walls with startling placards—this is the frankly avowed rule of the Salvationists. But why should we complain of this? Men must be known first before they can be heard. They must arrest first before they can convince.

On this same ground also a certain amount of what is called sensationalism may be pardoned. But the exaltation of sensationalism into a system is perilous in the extreme. *Crescit indulgens sibi*; it begets a craving which only increases by gratification. This is manifest already in the progress of the Salvation Army. In an organization framed to produce substantial and lasting results the sensational element should gradually give way to calm and patient methods of instruction. Of this I see as yet no signs in the movements of the Salvation Army. In its later public acts, as may be seen from its own organs, there is not only no abatement, but there is a positive increase in this respect. Sensationalism, and still more sensationalism, is its daily food. But granting for a moment that this amount of sensationalism is necessary, care should at least be taken that its character is in harmony with its aims. Nothing, I venture to think, can excuse the irreverence of its manifestations in this case. I would not wish to exaggerate. I do not for a moment hold the leaders responsible, except indirectly, for the excesses of their followers. I cannot refuse to accept the testimony of impartial witnesses, that at the meetings of the Salvation Army the demonstrations which, read calmly in the newspaper reports the next morning, strike the ear as irreverent even to the verge of blasphemy, are often redeemed at the moment by the obvious sincerity of the principal agents. But the fact remains, that the most solemn events of Biblical

history are travestied and the Saviour's name is profaned in parodies of common songs. Awe and reverence are the soul of the religious life. He therefore, who degrades the chief objects of religion by profane associations, strikes however unintentionally at the very root of religion. Nor again does it seem to me that any justification is possible of the encouragement given to children six or eight or ten years old to advertise publicly their own conversion and as publicly to proclaim the non-conversion of their parents. Yet this is the staple of the news in the columns of the *Little Soldier*. The dangerous unreality of all this—not the less dangerous because it may be unconscious in children of tender age—needs no comment. Yet these painful exhibitions are not only permitted, but encouraged and stimulated to the greatest extent by authority.

But the merits or defects, the successes or the failures, of the movement are after all rather the concern of the Salvationists than of ourselves. Our practical interest in the subject is summed up in two questions. What can we learn from their aims and methods? and, What should be our attitude as Churchmen towards them?

The lessons which they can teach us are neither few nor unimportant. I have already spoken of the courageous attempt to grapple with vice and infidelity in the masses—the magnificent hopefulness of the movement. Then there is the boldness and unconventionality of the methods. The Church of England

has awoke or is fast awaking to the fact that however great may be the value of its recognised instrumentalities in training a body of believers, it must take a fresh starting point and employ new agencies, if it is ever to overtake the spiritual arrears and evangelize the practical heathenism of the masses. The Salvation Army has thrown out new ideas of method. These will need careful sifting. Much will have to be rejected as unlawful on principle; much will be put aside as condemning itself by its results; but surely there is underlying all the extravagances and defects a residuum of highly valuable and suggestive matter of which we should do well to take account. What can be learnt from its military character? Stripped of its absolutism, in which it glories but which must soon or late prove its dissolution, does it not contain in itself the seeds of a more perfect type of organization than any with which we are familiar? What again are the lessons taught by its assiduous courting of notoriety, by its practice of public witnessing, by its finding immediate employment for its new converts? I strongly recommend those of my clergy, who have not done so already, to make themselves acquainted with the chief publications of the movement, not only the *Orders and Regulations* and the *Doctrines and Discipline*, but also those less directly authoritative, but even more instructive works, such as *Salvation Soldiery*, *Aggressive Christianity*, *Heathen England*, and the like. I recommend this, not only because they cannot otherwise obtain a full knowledge of the

significance of the movement—alike in its strength and in its weakness—but still more because (if I mistake not) they will find in them many stimulating and suggestive thoughts which will aid them in their own parochial organizations and ministry.

But a second and still more difficult question remains to be answered ; What should be our demeanour, as Churchmen, towards the Salvation Army ? Some would recommend an attitude of strict neutrality. Their counsel is summed up in the words of Gamaliel, ‘ Refrain from these men, and let them alone.’ This letting alone no doubt is an easy solution, but is it satisfactory ? The disposition of Gamaliel was truer than the disposition of the Sadducaic chief-priests ; but I do not see that it is commended in itself. It was Gamaliel’s business to try and find out whether this counsel and this work was of men, or of God. The attitude of the rulers of the Church of England towards Wesley in the last century has been deeply deplored in more recent times ; and there has naturally been an anxiety not to repeat the mistake. Hence a strong desire has been manifested on the part of many in authority to maintain friendly relations with the members of the Salvation Army.

I confess that my own sympathies have been altogether with this last view. It is urged indeed that this new form of revivalism differs in essential points from the Wesleyan movement ; that Wesley for instance professed a great reverence for the Sacraments and other Church ordinances which are entirely

ignored by the Salvationists; that—to say nothing else—Wesleyanism arose in the bosom of the Church itself, whereas the Salvation Army is altogether an external organization. This is true; but I cannot rid myself of the conviction that the same *temper*, which turns its back on the Salvation Army without enquiry, would also have had nothing to say to Wesley. The unconventional methods and the undeniable extravagances (for we must not forget the paroxysms which followed on Wesley's preaching) are often the real deterrents in the one case as in the other. For this reason, whenever I have been consulted by the Clergy, I have advised them to cultivate friendly relations with the Salvationists so far as this could be done without any unworthy compromise. Believing, as we do, that our Lord became incarnate not only to save individual souls but also to establish a visible kingdom upon earth, holding likewise that Baptism and the Holy Communion were especially ordained by Christ Himself not only as special means of grace but also as bonds of membership in His body, we cannot do anything which tends to disparage either the Church or the Sacraments. But without any unworthy concession on these points, there were obviously ways in which sympathy could be shown. Accordingly special services have been held with my approval in some churches for members of the Salvation Army; and in other ways co-operation has been found possible in some localities. It seemed to me that no opportunity should be lost by the clergy of guiding a

movement which, amidst many deplorable extravagances, contained so many elements of the highest good.

Though I confess that I am less hopeful of the movement than I was at first—for I seem to see its errors and its extravagances developing more rapidly than its excellences, as time goes on—I have no reason to regret the advice given. I do not see that we render ourselves responsible for these excesses by such sympathy and guidance as I have indicated. It would rather have been a matter of reproach, if by our coldness or inaction we lost our opportunity of influencing a movement which might have been made subservient to the highest interests of the Church of Christ.

But I see that such sympathy and co-operation is becoming daily more difficult. In theory indeed there is no barrier. The Salvation Army, as I said, repudiates the idea of setting up a church or a sect. But this repudiation is more theoretical than real. If its leaders would only be content to hold firmly to what seems to have been its first ideal, devoting themselves to the work of arousing souls from sin and drawing them towards Christ, but leaving them, when thus awakened and converted, to seek elsewhere the more continuous and fuller instruction which it has no means of supplying, and the privileges of Church membership and the benefits of the Sacraments which it altogether ignores—it might still do a truly magnificent, though incomplete, work. But it is fast

receding from this position. It is setting up its organization as a substitute for a Church. It is insisting upon this to the practical exclusion of Church membership in its adherents. This is the consequence of its militarism, which is at once its strength and its weakness. Every other consideration is made to bend before the exigencies of its organization. Thus, while professedly initial, it is making itself practically final. It is attempting to absorb all the religious life of its members in itself. It is fast degenerating into a sect.²⁴

4.

The Revised New Testament.

The year 1881 marks a signal epoch in the history of the English Bible. From the first appearance of Tyndall's New Testament in 1525 to the publication of the so called Authorized Version in 1611, the English Bible had undergone repeated revision. But the Version of King James was destined to reign without a rival for 270 years. It had indeed been touched from time to time by private adventurers ; but no serious and authoritative revision had been attempted. Yet meanwhile Greek scholarship had made great strides ; aids to exegesis had accumulated on all hands ; materials for the text had increased manifold, so that textual criticism, which can hardly be said to have existed at all at the beginning of this period, had grown into a vigorous maturity. But all faults had been condoned for the sake of its pure English, its majestic rhythm, and its familiar cadences.

Thus it held undisputed sway. A veneration has been accorded to it hardly less than the idolatry of the Massoretic text in the Hebrew or the Vulgate translation in the Latin.

This had not been so from the beginning. When it first appeared, it was assailed with a torrent of abuse. An eminent Hebrew scholar declared that he would sooner be 'torn in pieces than any such translation by his consent should be urged upon the poor Church of England.' Other assailants were still more violent. Even the learned Selden could only speak of it as 'being well enough so long as scholars have to do with it, but when it comes among the common people,' he added, 'what gear do they make of it!' A generation after its appearance my namesake, the great Hebraist, preaching before the House of Commons in 1645, still urged the desirableness of a revision of the Scriptures.

The circumstances under which the Revised Version was made are well known to all. A Committee appointed in the first instance by the Houses of the Southern Convocation and enlarged by co-optation sat for ten years and a half. It was composed of members of various schools of opinion within the Church of England, and of various Christian communities without. An American Committee also was formed, to which the work was transmitted from time to time for their suggestions, which were carefully considered. The version was revised and re-revised. No labour was spared to secure a satisfactory result.

The reception of the work is fresh in all our memories. The demand for it has been far beyond any parallel in literary history. It has been sold in England, if report be true, not by tens of thousands but by millions. It was reproduced whole, the day after its publication, in more than one American newspaper. It is found in cheap editions at every bookstall. It has been criticized far and wide, in magazine articles, in newspaper correspondence, in separate tracts and volumes, in sermons and charges.

Amidst all this criticism we are not surprised to find a few uncompromising antagonists. Its paramount claim to the respect of future generations will—I say this advisedly—be the restitution of a more ancient and purer text. Yet this is the very point which has called forth the severest censure. The appearance of the Revised Version was almost simultaneous with the publication of a critical text of the New Testament which has already vindicated its claim to the foremost place not only in England but on the Continent also, and will henceforward mark an era in textual criticism. Through the kindness of the editors the revisers had already had in their hands the sheets of this work while the revision was going on. This has been made the ground of accusation against the revisers' text. The similarities have been carefully noted, the divergences have been ignored. As regards the coincidences themselves, adverse critics have overlooked the fact that in all the most important points in which the revisers have adopted the same reading with the two

editors, they are supported likewise by one or other, sometimes by all, of the critical editions of the Greek Testament in recent times. Accordingly it has been represented that the revisers were led blindfold by the two editors, who also themselves were members of the body. A glance at the composition of the company ought alone to have prevented this surmise. No gathering of men was so likely, from the diversities of their previous training and prepossessions, to exercise independent and individual judgment on the questions submitted to them. If therefore the requisite majority of two-thirds was obtained in favour of any particular reading, it can only have been because the arguments commended themselves to the better judgment of the company. In the earlier stages the debated readings would naturally provoke more discussion, but gradually the accumulation of separate examples would furnish a storehouse of experience, and the inductions thus gained would furnish principles for future guidance which materially abridged the later debates. This would be the natural course of procedure in such a body; and it is no breach of confidence to say that such was the actual fact. But there was no sacrifice of independent judgment; because, when the principles were once seen and recognized by the great majority, the application of those principles to individual texts was easy.

The Bible Society has—I am informed—permitted its translators to adopt the text of the Revised Version where it commends itself to their judgment.

In this they have, I venture to think, exercised a wise discretion. Indeed I do not see how they could, with a proper sense of their responsibility to the heathen, have refused to allow some latitude in the matter of the text. It seems to be thought in some quarters that there is danger only in departing from the received readings. But is not the danger far greater in a stubborn conservatism? It is one thing to retain a confessedly spurious passage such as the Three Heavenly Witnesses in our existing English Version, though this may be painful enough. But it is quite another to introduce the words into a new foreign translation, thus deliberately sowing the seed of future misgivings and scepticisms, which may spring up a rank harvest of trouble in the generations to come.

The other point, on which adverse criticism has fastened, is the English of the Revised Version. On this question the verdict of the present generation cannot be unprejudiced. The ear, which has been accustomed to one rhythm in a well-known-passage, will not tolerate another, though it may be as good or better. And as with rhythm, so with diction. The familiar word or expression has, from long habit, attained a sanctity which bars the way to any rival. Time only can arbitrate fairly.

But an important question arises with respect to the use of the Revised Version. It is well known that the highest legal authority in this land has given his opinion that the so-called Authorized Version alone can lawfully be used in the Church. There is

indeed no direct evidence—beyond the words on the title-page—that it ever was authorized ; but the council books and registers of this period were destroyed, as the Lord Chancellor has pointed out, by fire ; and moreover its substitution for a previous version in the Gospels and Epistles in the Prayer Book at the last revision might be thought to convey indirectly an authorization.

Nevertheless the point seems to me far from clear. It may be a question whether the words on the title-page ‘Appointed to be read in Churches’ are intended to be permissive or compulsory. It is certain that even in the King’s Chapel long after its appearance preachers took their texts from the older version.²⁵ But still, regarding the matter as uncertain, I would not on the ground of a doubtful legality encourage my clergy to use the Revised Version in their churches ; and obviously much inconvenience and possibly some scandal might arise from the separate action of individuals where the voice of authority is silent.

5.

Vestments.

The peace of the Church has been troubled during the few years past by a question which it is difficult to regard as important in itself but which nevertheless raises momentous side issues and has threatened from time to time to lead to fatal results. For this reason it will be worth while to ask for a moment what is really involved in the dispute about vest-

ments. History corrects many errors and dispels many illusions. It tells us that in themselves vestments are absolutely unimportant. The chasuble in its origin had no ecclesiastical meaning. A common out-door garment of the ancients, the *casula* had not and could not have any sacerdotal or sacrificial bearing. The learned professions are proverbially conservative in matters of dress ; and the chasuble, with other garments now regarded as ecclesiastical, was retained by the clergy long after its general disuse. It was not till the eighth century, when symbolical interpretation in all forms was rife, that analogies were sought out in the clerical dress to the sacrificial robes of the Jewish priests. This being so, it is deeply to be regretted that in recent controversy the opponents, not less than the champions, of vestments should have encouraged the view that this sacrificial character was inherent in them. In the interests of peace it is well to minimise their significance. We cannot say how much perplexity for the future may not be created by thus investing them with a fictitious importance. It would be a real gain if we could be led to see that in themselves they are not worth contending for or against.

But from another point of view they have a real significance. The wearing of vestments at the celebration of the Holy Communion is at least the use of a distinctive dress. But this need not trouble any one. Whatever may be our view respecting the Holy Communion, all Churchmen alike regard it as the

highest office of Christian worship ; and so regarding it, they can hardly see any impropriety, though they may see much inexpediency, in marking it by a distinctive dress. This principle is conceded in the very judgment which pronounces the use of the chasuble illegal, for it rests on the validity of the Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth, which enjoin the use of the cope in certain cases. If a distinctive dress be objectionable, the objection holds as much against the cope as against the chasuble.

But are the vestments lawful after all ? The decision of the highest legal court has said distinctly no ; the judgment of many, based on the *prima facie* interpretation of the ornaments rubric, declares as emphatically yes. The questions which the dispute raises are manifold. Were the *Advertisements* of Queen Elizabeth ever issued by proper authority or not ? If authoritative, were they intended to supersede the then existing law regarding vestments, or only to supplement it ? Does the present ornaments rubric, as modified at the last revision of the Prayer Book, enjoin their use, or does it leave the matter optional ? Above all ought the *Advertisements*, supposing them to be authoritative, to be read into this rubric, which was later in time, or ought they not ? It is evident that the answers to these questions must depend largely on historical facts.²⁶ In this region of history new discoveries may at any moment materially alter the aspect of the question. Meanwhile is it any real strain on the conscience of a

clergyman to submit to the judgment of the highest legal authorities, even though he may not admit their validity as an ecclesiastical court, and may even think them mistaken ?

6.

Church and State.

It would be vain to deny that the relations between the Church and the State have become seriously entangled of late and still cause great anxiety. Only time and forbearance can untie the knot, which a headstrong impatience would cut at once. From either extreme point of view the perplexity vanishes. An Erastian conception, the absolute identity of the two, solves all difficulties ; but this we repudiate as sapping the very foundations of the Church. If the Church is not a spiritual corporation, a kingdom of Christ on earth, it is nothing at all. On the other hand the absolute independence of the two is simplicity itself in theory, but in practice it is a mere idle vision. The '*libera chiesa in libero stato*'—the dream of Cavour—sounds well enough as an epigram ; but it never has been and never can be realised in fact. So long as Church and State occupy the same ground, interest the same men, influence the same consciences, contact and conflict are inevitable. The Church was not free in the age of the persecutions under the Roman Emperors. The Church is not free in Italy in our own generation. The English Nonconformists discover from time to time that they too are entangled with the State. The law courts

step in, and decide questions which, though nominally only affecting property, really touch far more important interests. The Anglican Church in South Africa has found recently to her cost that she also is most seriously affected by the interposition of the State.

The more I read history, the more difficult I find it to trace definite and immutable principles, which shall under all circumstances regulate the relations between the Church and the State. I am speaking more especially now of the point which at the present moment causes the greatest anxiety—the judicial proceedings affecting the clergy; but it applies equally to other matters, such as the appointment of her chief officers. Principles, which at one time the clergy of the Church maintained with as much tenacity as if they were fundamental articles of the faith, have long since been abandoned with universal consent. No one would now fight for the immunity of the clergy from the jurisdiction of the criminal courts of the realm. It is shocking to the moral sense of this age that a clerk convicted of a grave crime should only be degraded, where a layman would be hanged. These lessons of the past we should do well to take to heart, as a caution for the future.

I am especially anxious to obtain a hearing for these lessons of history; because it seems to me that the most fatal consequences might ensue, if the conception of a hard and fast line between the rights

of the Church and State were maintained, and the clergy were to consider themselves exempted from all obligations the moment this line was transgressed. So far as I can see, utter and irreparable confusion would be the result, if this idea were pushed to its logical conclusion. What is to come of our parochial arrangements? How again would it affect the exercise of episcopal authority? Were the clergy of Cornwall justified in withdrawing their allegiance from the Bishop of Exeter to the Bishop of Truro, or the clergy of South Lancashire from the Bishop of Chester to the Bishops of Manchester and of Liverpool? The whole fabric of our institutions may be imperilled, if we yield no ecclesiastical obedience, unless the claim to this obedience can be traced to a distinctly ecclesiastical source.

I am driven therefore to the conclusion that, viewed from the side of the Church, the relations between Church and State, so far at least as regards existing complications, resolve themselves ultimately into a question of *expediency*. But while using this term expediency I deprecate its being understood in any low selfish sense, as applying to material interests. I refer solely to the spiritual interests of which the Church is the guardian. The question that she has to ask herself is whether her union with the State enables her to fulfil better the high spiritual functions which devolve upon her. But when we ask the question, no narrow interpretation can be given to her spiritual functions. If she had no other aspiration

than to gather together compact congregations with definite and well ordered services of one particular type, and to leave the masses of the population to themselves, then there is much to be said for a severance of the union. If any Churchman were content to take this view, I could imagine him not only awaiting disestablishment patiently, but even heartily welcoming it. He might thus be able better to carry out his own ideas unfettered and undisturbed. *Solitudinem faciunt, pacem appellant.* But if it be the true spiritual function of the Church—the ideal after which she aspires—to carry the Gospel into the highways and hedges and so to leaven the people of England throughout, then she will cling tenaciously to the advantages and the opportunities she enjoys by her union with the State. Nothing but the imperious mandate of conscience would justify her in voluntarily relinquishing the vantage ground on which God has placed her.

For the reasons which I have explained I cannot consider the questions relating to the authority and constitution of ecclesiastical courts which at the present moment are agitating the minds of men, as belonging to the essence of things. Nevertheless it is much to be regretted that in recent legislation so little regard has been paid to the technical principles which heretofore had been accepted with reference to ecclesiastical courts. These principles are at all events the result of long experience; they have established a firm hold on the minds of the clergy.

It is before all things necessary for good government that those who are subject to any jurisdiction should acknowledge its validity ; and this is especially the case in ecclesiastical matters, where the conscience is more or less touched. Any sudden break with the past is especially to be deprecated here. The *Ecclesiastical Courts Commission* now sitting will, it is hoped, lead to the reconstitution of our courts on a basis which will command the confidence of all who are directly concerned.

7.

Anxieties and Hopes.

The last two years have been a period of especial anxiety. The spectacle of an earnest and devoted clergyman, detained in gaol many weary months for conscience sake, has been felt on all hands to be a gross anachronism. Whatever men may have thought of the offence, there has been no difference of opinion as to the punishment. Yet for a time there seemed no hope of a solution. Mr. Green's opportune action has cut the knot which was past untying. All honour to him for this seasonable act which must have cost much sacrifice of personal feeling, probably also some resistance to party pressure. But it was a cheap price to pay for the peace of the Church. Those, who had no sympathy with Mr. Green's cause in the first instance, will be the most ready to do justice to his last step. The message of peace from the Primate's death-bed has removed another cause of

anxiety. The ecclesiastical atmosphere is clearer than it has been for some time past. But what is to come next?

No more prosecutions, I trust. The English Church is weary of them; the English people have had enough of them. If there is only reasonable patience and forbearance on both sides—a willingness to sacrifice something of self or of party for Christ and Christ's Church—I do not fear a renewal of them. On the other hand it is not fair to seek to extort from the Bishops a promise that under no possible circumstances they will consent to a prosecution. They cannot honourably give such a promise. But meanwhile they will be the least desirous of all men to promote legal proceedings. Not a few cases have been stopped hitherto by the veto which they possess; and doubtless this power will be exercised more and more in the same direction, if the occasion should arise.

The Public Worship Regulation Act made the prosecution for ecclesiastical offences easy. But the facilities thus afforded were dangerous, unless some power of regulating matters relating to public worship was created at the same time. It is deeply to be regretted that the Bishop of London's Bill did not become law. It would have materially eased, if not altogether removed, the strain. Many accompaniments of divine worship are not defined by rubric; some of them lie beyond the possibility of definition. The principle laid down, that what is not enjoined is

forbidden, cannot be strictly carried out. It would paralyse public worship. We all infringe this principle at some point; we cannot help infringing it. It would not be desirable at any time that absolutely rigid lines should be laid down. But such inflexibility is especially inopportune in an age when the development of spiritual life of the Church seeks new outlets in devotional worship. The Public Worship Regulation Act tends to promote rigidity. This tendency can only be counteracted by the creation of some authority which, being set in motion easily, shall have power to modify, to relax, to reconstruct rubrics, and generally to regulate the conditions of Divine Worship within prescribed limits.

But it may be some time before this end is attained. Meanwhile let us exercise all patience. It is a matter of common complaint that the Church is trammelled and fettered by her connexion with the State. Doubtless she cannot expect the advantages of this connexion without paying the price of it. But practically no Church is so free as our own. The evidence of this freedom is twofold. There is first of all her comprehensiveness, and there is secondly her activity.

Her comprehensiveness is the great boast of the Church of England. If we have been tempted to forget or despise this our heritage, death has recalled us to a better mind. The graves of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley and Edward Bouverie Pusey are hardly yet

closed. We have mourned over the one and the other with equal sincerity. Each has taught us valuable lessons. The Church would have been seriously impoverished by the exclusion of either. May this comprehensiveness always be ours. At the present moment at least there seems little fear of our losing it; for from the force of circumstances it is most jealously guarded by those whose temper of mind and cast of opinion would least predispose them in this way.

But a still stronger evidence, than the comprehension of various men, is the manifestation of varied activity. Liberty means the capacity of movement and of action. If this is the truest test of freedom, then no Church is or has been more free than our own. No doubt this very energy tends in its restlessness to make any restraint feel galling. But it is often good for the moral health of an institution, as it is good for the moral health of an individual, that it should submit to restraints and limitations. They are its proper discipline.

Never since the earliest days of Christianity, has any Church exhibited greater signs of active, healthy, vigorous life. It is the manifoldness of the developments, which arrests and compels our attention. Public worship, devotional literature, hymnology, architecture and music, charitable and educational institutions, parochial organizations, mission preaching, Bible classes, guilds, sisterhoods—in whatever direction we look it is the same.

And no Church since the beginning has seemed so manifestly pointed out by the finger of Almighty God to fulfil a great part in His providential designs as the Church of England in our day. She has not broken with any social or intellectual aspirations of her own age; and yet she has surrendered no sacred principles or traditions of the past. She stands midway between the irregular forces of Protestant Nonconformity and the rigid militarism of Rome. She is showing daily more and more aptitude for dealing with the masses at home, though she has still very much to learn. She is occupying year by year a more prominent position among the Churches abroad. The See of Canterbury in strong and vigorous hands has been something more than the Primacy of All England. It has proved the Patriarchate, not indeed in name, but in effect, of a vast aggregate of Anglican communities scattered over the continent and islands throughout the world. The sense of her Catholicity has been restored to the Church of England through the spread of the English race.

Her mission is unique; her capabilities and opportunities are magnificent. Shall we spoil this potentiality, shall we stultify this career, shall we mar this destiny by impatience, by self-will, by party spirit, by misguided and headstrong zeal, by harsh words embittering strife, by any narrowness of temper or of aim or of view? A grave responsibility—no graver can well be conceived—rests upon us all.

Never were our hopes brighter; never were our anxieties keener; never was there greater need of that divine charity which beareth all things, believeth all things. Happy they who so feel, and so act; for theirs is the crown of crowns.

NOTES.

NOTE 1, p. 6.

The Act regulating the appointment of Suffragans is 26 Henry VIII c. 14 (A.D. 1534). Berwick is one of twenty-six places named to give titles to these Suffragans. The Act however does not require that the Suffragan shall take his title from a town lying within the same diocese in which he is to exercise episcopal functions. It is enough that the see 'be within the province whereof the bishop that doth name him is' (see Phillimore, *Ecclesiastical Law* I. p. 97). Soon after the passing of this Act Bishop Tonstall procured the appointment of Thomas Sparke as Bishop of Berwick (A.D. 1537). A full account of this person is given in Raine's *North Durham* p. 127 sq. He had been educated at Durham College, Oxford, and was Prior of Holy Island at the time of the dissolution (A.D. 1536). He was also one of the first Prebendaries of Durham Cathedral. He died Master of Greatham Hospital (A.D. 1571) and was buried there. His will, dated A.D. 1563, is extant.

At an earlier date we read from time to time of Suffragans acting under the Bishops of Durham. Thus Thomas, Bishop of Dromore, acted in this capacity under Bishop Neville (A.D. 1440), and a certain Prior of Brenkburn under Bishop Dudley (A.D. 1478-9): see Raine's *Auckland Castle* pp. 49, 50, 55. The Act of Henry VIII did not create but regulate the office.

NOTE 2, p. 6.

This Act is printed in full by Sir T. D. Hardy in his Preface to *Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense* I. p. lxxxv sq., published in the Master of the Rolls series. It begins thus:

"Exhibita est Regie magestati in Parlamento predicto Billa quedam formam actus in se continens;

Where the Byshoppyrke of Durham ys at this p'nte time voyde of

a Byshoppe, so as the gifte thereof remainethe in the Kinge Maiestie most good and gracyous pleasure to bee dysposed and bestowed as to his princely wisdomes shall seame beste and most convenient. And forasmuche as the cyrcuite and compace of thordynarye jurisdiction of the sayd Byshopryk ys lardge and greate and extendethe into many shieres and counties, and thone of them being so farre dystante from thother, so as the chardge thereof may not conveniently bee supplied, and well and sufficiently dischargd by one Ordynarye or one Byshoppe. And foreasmuch as the Kinge matie of his most godly dysposition ys desirous to have Goddes most holy and sacredd Woorde in thos partyes adioyning to the borders of Scotlande being now wylde and barbarous for lacke of good doctrine and godly educac'on in good l'res and learning plentifully taught, preached, and set foorth amongst his loving subiectes ther as thanckes be unto God the same ys well exersysed and put in vse in divers other p'ties of this Realme, doeth therefore mynde and ys fully determyned to have two seuerall ordynarye Seas of Bishoppes to be erected and established within the lymytes, boundes, and jurisdicc'ons of the said Bishopprick of Durham, whereof thone shalbee called the sea of the Bishopprick of Durham, and thother the sea of the Byshopprick of Newcastle vpon Tyne, and tappoint two apte, meete, and godly learned men in Goddes holy Woorde to be Bishoppes of the same seuerall dyoces and to endowe them seuerally withe manours, landes, tenementes, and other hereditaments with suche good and honourable lyberties and priuelege as shalbe mete and convenient for any of the Kinge subiectes to haue oor enioye; that is to say, the sayd Bishopricke of Durham withe manours, landes, tenementes, and other heredytamentes of the clere yerely valours of two thowsande marckes. And the said Bishoprike of Newcastle withe manours, landes, tenementes, and other hereditamentes of the clere yerelye value of one thowsande marckes. And also to make the sayd town of Newcastle vpon Tyne one cytye, whiche shalbe called the Cytye of Newcastle vpon Tyne. And to prouide and appoint ther one church which shalbee called the Cathedrall Church of Newcastle vpon Tyne and the Sea of the Bishoprike thereof. And also to erecte and make one deanrye and chapter ther and to endowe the same withe convenient possessions and hereditamentes for the mayntenance thereof. And to make statutes and ordenances for the better ordering of the sayd deanrye and chapter, whiche good and

godly intente and purpose can not conveniently bee fully finished and p'fected but by theyde and auctoritee of p'lement. Be it therefore inacted by thauctorite of this p'lement that the said Bishoprike of Durham, to gyther withall thordynarye jurisdic'ons thereunto belonging and appertaining shalbe adiudged from hensforthe clerely dissolved extinguished and determined. And that the King, our Souereyne Lorde, shall from hensfoorth the haue, holde, possede and enioye, to him, his heires and successoures for euer, all and singler honnoures, castelles, manoures, lordshippes, etc..... which dothe apperteine or belong to the sayd Bishoprike of Durham, in as large and ample maner and fourme as the late Bishoppe of the sayd Bishoprike, or any of his predecessoures Bishoppes ther had helde or occupied or of right ought to haue hadd holden or occupied in the right of the sayd Bishoprike, etc."

NOTE 3, p. 8.

The populations of the two counties respectively at different epochs are as follow :

A.D.	DURHAM.	NORTHUMBERLAND.
1801	149,384	168,078
1821	193,511	212,589
1831	239,256	236,959
1841	307,963	266,020
1851	390,997	303,568
1861	508,666	343,025
1871	685,045	386,959
1881	867,586	434,024

The population of the Diocese of Durham according to the census of 1881 was as follows :—

County of Durham	-	-	-	-	-	867,586
County of Northumberland	-	-	-	-	-	434,024
Alston and Chapelries	-	-	-	-	-	4,621
Total						1,306,231

Alston with its Chapelries forms part of the new Diocese of Newcastle.

NOTE 4, p. 9.

The resolution of the Town Council of Newcastle mentioned in this paragraph is dated June 14, 1854. It was proposed by Sir John Fife, and carried unanimously. These are the terms :

“That the Council adopt a memorial to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and to the Secretary of State for the Home Department showing that the Diocese of Durham is too extensive for its proper administration, and to institute a Diocese of Northumberland, to purchase the Vicarage of Newcastle-on-Tyne from the Bishop of Carlisle, and to make St. Nicholas’ Church in Newcastle-on-Tyne the Cathedral, and to raise Newcastle into the dignity of a Metropolitan City.”

The following is an extract from the Memorial to the Cathedral Commissioners (*Third and Final Report*, May 25, 1855, p. xli) :

“The Diocese of Durham contains at the present time an estimated population of nearly 770,000, and it extends from north to south a distance of more than *one hundred miles*, with an area equal to *one-eighteenth part* of the whole of England.

“The progressive increase in the population has of late years been unusually great and rapid : the increase in the counties of Durham and Northumberland alone, since the year 1831, amounting to nearly 300,000 inhabitants.

“Owing to the opening out of fresh mines, and the activity of commercial enterprise, new and large masses of the working classes are constantly springing up, both in the mining and manufacturing districts, and at all the seaports within the said Diocese. Newcastle-upon-Tyne has more than trebled its inhabitants in forty years, but has only one district church more at present than it had 300 years ago : and at least 6,000 children of the labouring classes are without school accommodation in the borough. The results are what might naturally be expected—a fearful increase of crime, juvenile profligacy of a most degraded character, with defective information on religious subjects, and much indifference to the claims and duties of Christianity.

“From the above premises it is respectfully submitted that the Diocese of Durham, as at present constituted, with its overgrown and increasing population full of energy and enterprise, is too cumbersome for the physical powers of one Bishop where an active *personal* superintendence is so much required : it seems not unreasonable to hope that provision be made at the next voidance of the see of

Durham for the creation of Northumberland into a separate Bishoprick, which shall include the county of Northumberland, with the boroughs of the counties of Newcastle-on-Tyne and Berwick-on-Tweed, with such parts of the county of Durham as are situated in the county of Northumberland.”

“The extraordinary increase of our population is in a great measure attributable to the development of the mineral resources of the Bishop and Chapter of Durham.”

NOTE 5, p. 10.

Those who are interested in the history of the subject will find useful information in a pamphlet by Canon Hume of Liverpool, entitled *Growth of the Episcopate in England and Wales during Seventeen Centuries*, 1880, and in *The Increase of the Episcopate, with particular reference to the Division of the Diocese of Durham*, 1880, by Derwent.

NOTE 6, p. 11.

Extract from Bishop Baring's Charge, delivered September, 1878:

“A Bill for the increase of the Episcopate, which will materially affect the welfare of the Diocese, inasmuch as it contemplates the formation of a new See for Northumberland, has received the sanction of the Legislature, and I avail myself of this opportunity of stating the reasons which induce me to think that a division of Diocese is much neededThe expediency of the subdivision of this Diocese is based not upon any general theory as to the necessity of an increase in the Episcopate, but upon the unusual extent of its territory, and the unparalleled increase in its population. It extends from north to south a distance of more than one hundred miles, with an area equal to one-eighteenth part of the whole of England. There are only three dioceses with a larger area, and only five with a larger population: and two of these will be divided under the arrangements of this new Act.....

“But if the need of more Episcopal supervision was thus acknowledged more than twenty years ago (1855), it is more apparent in the present day, when not merely has the population continued to increase at a still more rapid rate, so that the census of 1871 exhibited an increase in ten years of more than 220,000 souls, but when, through the growing zeal and liberality of laity and clergy,

the number of benefices since the year 1857 has risen from 260 to 372, and the number of clergy from 353 to 531. When therefore in the autumn of 1876 I referred the question of the expediency of the formation of a see for Northumberland, whilst there was much difference of opinion expressed as to the sources from whence the endowment should be obtained and the amount of that endowment, the judgment was almost unanimous as to the desirableness of the creation of a new See. It was not to be expected that in arriving at this conclusion many of the clergy of Northumberland should not feel much regret at the prospect of a separation from the ancient See and Cathedral of Durham, with which they had been associated so many years, but they were found willing to sacrifice their personal feelings and predilections in order to forward an object which seemed so manifestly calculated to advance the best interests of our northern Church. The prospect of the accomplishment of this good work is I fear remote."

NOTE 7, p. 15.

The following is a brief statement of the sums contributed to the Newcastle Bishopric Endowment :

Mr. Hedley's Legacy - - - -	16,200	0	0
Subscriptions—			
General Fund - 48,975	10	6	
Special Congress Fund 3,308	19	2	
	<u>52,284</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>
Church Collections - - - -	1,871	2	11
Benwell Tower, estimated at - -	12,500	0	0
	<u>Total</u>	<u>£82,855</u>	<u>12 7</u>

Mr. W. Hedley, the brother of the testator, had a life interest in the property left for the endowment of the Newcastle Bishopric. He kindly consented to relinquish this in order to facilitate the immediate creation of the See, and the sum mentioned, £16,200, represents the balance paid over to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners after compensation for the relinquishment. This sum was paid by the executors on August 11, 1879, and invested by the Commissioners, so as to produce an income of £605 14s. 2d. per annum.

In some cases it is difficult to say whether a contribution ought to be set down to the General Fund or to the Special Congress Fund ;

but no sum is here set down to the Congress Fund which was not promised during or in consequence of the Congress.

The amount of the General Fund, as here given, does not include a contribution of £2,000 promised by the late Col. Joicey, but not paid owing to his lamented death.

It will be interesting to learn how much of the total was contributed in large sums. The large contributions are as follows :

£10,000	-	-	-	2
£3,000	-	-	-	1
£2,000	-	-	-	1
£1,000	-	-	-	5
£600	-	-	-	2
£500	-	-	-	9
£300	-	-	-	1
£250	-	-	-	6
£200	-	-	-	9
£150	-	-	-	3
£105	-	-	-	8
£100	-	-	-	47

The whole expenses of collection, which have fallen on the Fund, have been less than £290.

The Bishopricks Act, 1878, contains a provision that if a fitting Episcopal residence is provided to the satisfaction of the Commissioners the annual value shall be reckoned as £500 towards the minimum endowment of the See. I have therefore set down the value of Benwell Tower as representing a capital sum of £12,500, interest being reckoned at £4 per cent. Benwell Tower has never been valued.

The sums collected (with the exception of a small balance still to be handed over) have, after payment of expenses, been invested, and the interest forms the income of the new See. In addition to this source of income the Bishopric of Newcastle is endowed with £1,000 per annum withdrawn from the income of the Bishop of Durham from the moment of the creation of the new See.

NOTE 8, p. 19.

Extracts relating to the origin of the Officialty, from '*Historiæ Dunelmensis scriptores tres*,' Surtees Society, vol. 9.

Bulla Gregorii Pape vii, universalibus de possessionibus et libertatibus concessis ecclesie Dunelmensi. A.D. 1083. Appendix ix, p. vii.

Item, secundum Lindisfarnensis abbatis antiquam dignitatem, praedicto Priori dexteram Episcopi, et primum locum et honorem post episcopum, et in ecclesia Dunelmensi sedem abbatis in choro, et omnia officia et jura Abbatis super monachos et eorum possessiones, nomine Prioris, indulgemus; et super ecclesias et clericos ecclesiis deservientes, quas in Episcopatu Dunelmensi cujuscunque largicione canonice adipisci valebit, Archidiaconatus officium ejus discrecioni delegamus; quatenus omnia ad idem monasterium pertinentia ejus regimini et dispositioni, adhibito dumtaxat Capituli sui consilio, subjecta, in commune commodum extendantur. p. viii.

Carta regis Willielmi qui confirmat libertates nobis concessas causa archidiaconatus. Appendix p. xvi.

... et, secundum antiquam Lindisfarnensis ecclesiae dignitatem, Priori dexteram Episcopi sui, et primum locum et honorem in omnibus post episcopum, et in ecclesia Dunelmensi sedem abbatis in choro sinistro, et omnia officia et jura Abbatis super monachos et illorum possessiones, nomine Prioris concessi; ac super ecclesias eorum, et clericos ecclesiis deservientes, quas per episcopatum Dunelmensem cujuscunque largicione adipisci potuerint, archidiaconatus officium eis confirmavi.

Carta W. regis primi de confirmatione libertatum quas W. episcopus dedit monachis et de confirmatione archidiaconatus. Appendix p. xvii.

Sed et archidiaconatum Priori Turgoto et successoribus ejus sicut nunc habet, concedo, secundum concessionem W. eorundem episcopi.

Carta Willielmi episcopi primi de privilegio spiritualitatis et libertatibus temporalitatis a Willielmo primo rege Angliae, et a Gregorio Papa septimo confirmatis. Appendix p. xxiv.

Et sit Archidiaconus omnium ecclesiarum suarum in episcopatu Dunelmensi, ut nullus super eum de ecclesiis vel clericis suis se intromittat..... Volumus etiam, ut nobis absentibus, praedictus Prior in synodo de querelis et aliis Christianitatis officiis, quae ipse et Archidiaconi per se facere possint, vices nostras agat. Curiam vero suam, quam dominus meus Rex Willielmus dedit et concessit eidem Priori et Conventui, ita libere et honorifice in omnibus, sicut habemus nostram, eis concedimus et confirmamus. p. xxv.

Robertus de Graystaves p. 46. Cap. viii. *Nota pro jure Archidiaconatus.*

Anno domini etc, MCCLXXI, in capella sua de Aukeland, coram domino episcopo, recognovit magister Robertus de S. Agata archidiaconus Dunelmensis Priorem Dunelmensem fuisse archidiaconum in ecclesiis sibi appropriatis infra aquas; et archidiaconos, praedecessores suos, nomine Prioris et non nomine proprio, jurisdictionem in illis ecclesiis exercuisse, et propter hoc Priori pensionem annuam exsolvisse.

The Official exercised Archidiaconal control over 39 parishes and 74 clergy (39 incumbents, 35 curates) at the time when the Officialty was abolished.

NOTE 9, p. 21.

The old Deaneries were :

- | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Chester (East) | 5. Easington (North) |
| 2. Chester (West) | 6. Easington (South) |
| 3. Darlington (North) | 7. Stockton. |
| 4. Darlington (South) | |

The new Deaneries are :

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Jarrow | } Archdeaconry of
Durham. | 8. Auckland | } Archdeaconry of
Auckland. |
| 2. Chester-le-Street | | 9. Stanhope | |
| 3. Ryton | | 10. Darlington | |
| 4. Durham | | 11. Stockton. | |
| 5. Houghton-le-Spring | | | |
| 6. Wearmouth | | | |
| 7. Easington | | | |

NOTE 10, p. 23.

New Parishes formed since Bishop Baring's Visitation, 1878 :

DURHAM.

- | |
|------------------------------------------|
| (a) 1. S. Stephen, Sunderland |
| (a) 2. S. Peter, Stockton |
| (a) 3. S. Paul, West Pelton |
| (a) 4. S. John, Stillington |
| (a) 5. S. Simon, South Shields |
| (a) 6. S. Mark, Eldon |
| (a) 7. S. George, Fatfield |
| (a) 8. S. Michael and All Angels, Westoe |
| (a) 9. S. Nicholas, Hedworth |
| 10. S. Edmund, Bearpark |

11. S. Cuthbert, Monkwearmouth
12. S. Peter, Jarrow
13. S. John, Monk Hesleden.

NORTHUMBERLAND.

- (a) 1. S. Cuthbert, Newcastle-on-Tyne
- (a) 2. S. Matthew, Newcastle-on-Tyne
3. S. Cuthbert, Haydon Bridge
4. S. Oswald-in-Lee with St. Mary, Bingfield
5. S. Mary Magdalene, Prudhoe.

The districts marked (a) were constituted previously to 1878, but they only became new Parishes after 1878, on the consecration of their respective churches.

The following new districts have been formed in addition to the above, but their churches not being consecrated, they have not become new Parishes :

DURHAM.

Waterhouses
S. Oswald, Hebburn.

NORTHUMBERLAND.

S. George, Cullercoats.

Churches consecrated since the last Visitation :

1879. S. Stephen, Sunderland
Bearpark
Fatfield
Eldon
1880. S. Matthew, Newcastle
South Hylton
Stillington
S. Simon, South Shields
West Pelton
S. Cuthbert, Monkwearmouth
Mickley (Prudhoe)
S. Philip, Bishop Auckland
Duddo
1881. S. Cuthbert, Newcastle
S. Peter, Jarrow
S. Peter, Stockton
1882. Hedworth
S. Michael, Westoe
S. John, Monk Hesleden.

NOTE 11, p. 24.

The three questions relating to the Diocesan Conference have since been settled as follows :

- (1) A larger representation both of clergy and of laity.
- (2) The Conference to be held in alternate years.
- (3) Questions to be discussed but not voted upon.

NOTE 12, p. 27.

At the *Proceedings at the Meeting of the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences*, March 13, 1883, it was reported that

“Twenty-four Diocesan Conferences send Lay and Clerical representatives to the Central Council. For the present Salisbury and Liverpool decline to join, and the subject has not yet been brought before Exeter, York, or Durham.”

NOTE 13, p. 28.

Arrangements have since been made for the separate organization, in the two Dioceses, of all the Diocesan Societies, except the *Diocesan Board of Inspection*, which will be a matter for future consideration. The Diocesan Branch of the *Church of England Temperance Society* for Durham has been reorganized, and is thus entering (it is hoped) upon a fresh and still more vigorous career of usefulness (see *Diocesan Magazine*, March 1883, p. 39).

NOTE 14, p. 33.

Since the charge was delivered, commissions have been issued to several additional lay-readers. The movement however is still in its infancy, and I must look to the practical experience and thoughtful consideration of the parochial clergy to advise and assist me in the development of this movement, which I am more and more persuaded is the great problem laid before the Church of our day. Thirty-one of these lay readers were publicly admitted at the service in Durham Cathedral on Friday, June 22nd.

NOTE 15, p. 35.

I am not yet able to report substantial progress in this matter.

NOTE 16, p. 37.

The great gathering of these and other Church Societies in Durham Cathedral on Friday, June 22 (see *Diocesan Magazine* p. 100) is a fact to be remembered with deep thankfulness.

NOTE 17, p. 42.
 SUMMARY OF THE ORDINATIONS OF DEACONS DURING THE FOUR YEARS PRECEDING BISHOP BARING'S
 LAST VISITATION (1875-1878).

	1875.		1876,		1877.		1878.		TOTAL.
	TRIN.	ADV.	TRIN.	ADV.	TRIN.	ADV.	TRIN.	ADV.	
Oxford	1	...	2	...	1	1	2	1	8
Cambridge	4	1	1	3	...	2	2	3	16
Dublin	1	1	2	...	1	1	6
Durham, B.A.	1	1	3	2	1	1	...	2	14
Do. L.Th.	3	3	3	5	4	...	10	5	30
Other Universities	2	2
Theological Colleges	4	1	11	5	12	3	6	1	43
Literates	1	1	2
	21		38		28		34		121

SUMMARY OF THE ORDINATIONS OF DEACONS DURING THE FOUR YEARS PRECEDING THE PRESENT VISITATION
(1879-1882).

	1879.		1880.		1881.		1882.		TOTAL.
	TRIN.	ADV.	TRIN.	SEP. ADV.	TRIN.	SEP. ADV.	TRIN.	SEP. ADV.	
Oxford - - -	1	1	5	...	2	...	1	4	25
Cambridge - -	3	3	4	6	6	6	1	6	43
Dublin - - -	1	...	1
Durham, B.A. -	1	...	3	1	1	1	8
Do. L.Th. - -	4	2	...	5	2	2	1	2	26
Other Universities -	1	...	2	3
Theological Colleges -	9	3	1	4	...	1	24
Literates - - -	2	...	2	4
	27		40		35		32		134

NOTE 18, p. 45.

The statistics of the confirmations during the last three periods of four years—from Visitation to Visitation—are as follows :

YEARS.	FEMALES.	MALES.	TOTAL.
1871—1874	9,471	6,222	15,693
1875—1878	10,454	7,048	17,502
1879—1882	15,404	10,411	25,815

NOTE 19, p. 46.

The following parishes return amounts for various church works during the four years, above £2,000.

Auckland, S. Andrew	£7,800	West Pelton - - -	£9,225
Aycliffe - - -	- 3,500	Ryton - - -	- 2,038
Bearpark - - -	- 4,600	Shildon - - -	- 3,350
Croxdale - - -	- 2,320	Silksworth - - -	- 2,270
Durham, S. Margaret's	- 3,000	S. Shields, S. Hilda's	- 4,500
Fatfield - - -	- 7,775	„ H. Trinity	- 4,341
Hebburn, S. Oswald's	- 2,080	„ S. Simon's	- 3,500
Jarrow, S. Peter's -	- 5,900	„ South Westoe	- 3,460
Jarrow Grange -	- 6,500	Stillington - - -	- 2,500
Middleton-in-Teesdale	- 5,000	Stockton, S. Peter's	- 6,000
Monk Hesleden, S. John's	2,200	Sunderland, H. Trinity	- 2,321

By an error, a large sum is reckoned twice in the total given in the text, £155,000. The correct total is about £145,000. This however does not represent the whole sum spent. It is derived from the returns of 130 parishes alone.

NOTE 20, p. 49.

The following is a table of the incumbencies vacated either by resignation (R) or by death (D) during the four years which elapsed between the two last Visitations (A.D. 1879—1882). During the last year (1882) no account is taken of Northumberland, as the diocese of Newcastle was founded in the earlier half of the year. Cases of exchange are included under R. Where no outgoing incumbent is named, the incumbency was created for the first time.

BENEFICE.	PREVIOUS INCUMBENT.	HOW VACATED.	SUCCESSOR.	FORMERLY.
1879.				
Belmont V ...	T. Crossman ...	D	M. Graham ...	C. All Saints', Monkwearmouth
Greatham V ...	J. Macartie ...	R.	W. W. Morrison ...	C. of Boston
New Shildon V ...	W. Hayton ...	R	T. Cooper ...	V. of Playford
Allenheads V	J. M. Lister ...	C. of Tynemouth
Berwick, S. May's, V ...	B. J. Holmes ...	R	J. King ...	Darlington
Usworth R... V ...	T. Thackeray... ..	R	M. M. Simpson ...	C. of Washington
Waterhouses V	C. H. Barton ...	C. Ven. Bede, Monkwearmouth
Bearpark V	A. K. B. Granville... ..	C. of S. Oswald's, Durham
Woodhorn V ...	E. N. Mangin... ..	D	E. Shortt ...	V. of S. Anthony, Byker
S. Anthony, Byker, V ...	E. Shortt ...	R	J. Sunter ...	C. of Holy Trinity, Tynemouth
Belford V ...	C. T. Darnell... ..	R	C. Robertson ...	M. of All Saints's, Strichen, Aberdeenshire
1880.				
Whitworth V ...	C. Carr ...	D	W. Mirriceles ...	R. of Hawthorn
Berwick-on-Tweed V ...	J. G. Rowe ...	R	C. Baldwin ...	R. of Topcroft
Aycliffe V ...	J. D. Eade ...	R	C. J. A. Eade ...	C. of Aycliffe
Belmont V ...	M. Graham ...	D	E. F. Chapman ...	C. of Gateshead Fell
Wooler V ...	S. Green ...	D	J. S. Pickles ...	V. of S. Saviour's, Everton

BENEFICIERS.	PREVIOUS INCUMBENT.	HOW VACATED.	SUCCESSOR.	FORMERLY.
1880.				
Shilbottle V	J. B. Roberts...	D	J. Golightly ...	C. of Wooler
Hawthorn R	W. Mirrieles...	R	W. E. Scott ...	Master of Northallerton Grammar School
Cambo V	C. Bennett	R	J. Fairbrother	
Ellingham R	C. Thorp	D	W. Wilson	V. of Ryhope
Wark R	G. Bellamy	D	S. Beale	R. of Falstone
Falstone R	S. Beale	R	R. R. Picton ...	Chaplain of Chatham Dock
Ryhope V	W. Wilson	R	H. W. Barber	C. of Houghton-le-Spring
Monkwearmouth, S. Cuthbert's	W. A. MacGonigle...	C. of Monkwearmouth
Mitford V	C. C. Snowden	D	T. A. Holcroft	C. of Abingdon
Cullercoats, S. George, V	R. T. Wheeler	R	J. Seaver	C. of Cheltenham
Bingfield with S. Oswald V	R. Hutton	C. of S. John's Lee
Penshaw R	P. Thompson	D	J. H. Fox	V. of Hamer
Whalton R	J. E. Elliot	R	J. Walker	C. of Whalton
Meldon R	J. Chalmers	R	J. W. Mason	R. of Purthoe
Cramlington V	J. S. Hind	R	W. W. Garrett	C. of Cramlington
Shotley V	R. Thompson...	D	R. W. Wilson	C. of Deptford
S. John's, Weardale	J. Green	D	R. Shephard ...	V. of S. Philip's, Newcastle

BENEFICE.	PREVIOUS INCUMBENT.	HOW VACATED.	SUCCESSOR.	FORMERLY.
North Gosforth V Cornhill ...	W. S. Wright ... S. A. Tyler ...	D D	E. Greenhow ... W. L. Holland ...	Diocesan Inspector for Llandaf Ch. to Embassy at Riga
1881.				
Newcastle, S. Philip's, V Whittingham V Pelton ...	R. Shepherd ... R. W. Goodenough. R. A. Oram ...	R D R	W. L. Cunningham. W. Shield ... H. E. Savage... ..	C. of S. Peter's, Newcastle V. of Mansergh Domestic Chaplain Lord Bishop of Durham
Sadberge V Elwick Hall R Hunwick V Ryton R ... Gateshead R ...	R. M. Moorsom ... J. A. Boddy ... J. Richards ... W. C. Streatfeild ... E. Prest ...	R D R R R	J. W. Baron ... R. K. Cook ... E. G. H. Caswell ... E. Prest ... W. Moore Ede ...	V. of Balderstone V. of Smallbridge C. of S. Andrew Auckland R. of Gateshead Evening Lecturer S. Thomas', Newcastle
Hebburn, S. Oswald's, V Benfieldside V ... Jarrow, S. Peter's ... Cornforth V F. B. Thompson M. Duggan ...	 D D	P. W. Clarke... .. G. H. Ross Lewin... W. J. Burn ... T. N. Roberts ...	C. of Hexham C. of Hurworth C. of Jarrow C. of S. Stephen's, South Shields
Earsdon V ... Beltingham V ...	R. A. Gould ... J. O. Clark ...	D D	E. Greenhow ... G. Reed ...	V. of North Gosforth C. of Haltwhistle

BENEFICE.	PREVIOUS INCUMBENT.	HOW VACATED.	SUCCESSOR.	FORMERLY.
1881.				
Walker V	C. Thompson...	D	J. S. Beckwith	C. of Benfieldside
Gosforth, North, V ..	E. Greenhow ...	R	C. J. Naters ...	M. of Blyth Chapel
Whitburn R	W. M. Hitchcock	R	G. F. Price ...	V. of Romford
Tynemouth, s. Saviour's, V	T. Featherstone	D	H. Hicks ...	V. of S. Peter's, North Shields
Gateshead, H. Trinity, V	W. Bennett ...	R	H. W. Stewart	C. of S. Hilda's, South Shields
Birtley V	F. W. Bewsher	D	W. S. Guest Williams	C. of Chester-le-Street
N. Shields, S. Peters, V	H. S. Hicks ...	R	C. M. Woosnam	Ch. to Seamen's Missions
Gateshead, S. James', R	S. A. Herbert	R	H. R. Stogden	C. of S. Nicholas', Newcastle
Gosforth R... ..	J. A. Charlton	D	F. W. Bindley	Precentor of Cape Town
Hart V	J. Stewart ...	D	T. A. Thorne...	C. of Hart
1882.				
Grindon V	W. Cassidi ...	D	H. A. V. Boddy	C. of Grindon
Holmside V	E. McGowan...	D	R. Brent ...	Ch. of Newcastle Infirmary
Jarrow R	E. Liddell ...	R	C. R. J. Loxley	C. of S. Edmund's, Northampton
Collierley V	B. Hurst ...	D	J. Gonnall ...	V. of Calder Vale
Ryton R	E. Prest... ..	D	T. H. Chester...	V. of South Shields
Hebburn V	W. Hedley ...	D	E. A. Langstone	C. of Shildon
Frosterley V	W. S. Meade ...	R	F. C. Jagg.....	R. of Luddenham

NOTE 21, p. 51.

As a successful resistance has hitherto been offered to including religious statistics in the decennial Census, the relative strength of the Church of England and Nonconformity can only be estimated in irregular ways.

In the *British Contributions to Foreign Missions*, published annually by the Rev. W. A. Scott Robertson, I find the following Statistics for 1882 :

Church of England Societies - - - -	£500,306
Joint Societies of Churchmen and Nonconformists - - - -	154,813
English and Welsh Nonconformist Societies -	348,175
Scotch and Irish Presbyterian Societies - -	176,362
Roman Catholic Societies - - - -	11,519
	<hr/>
Total British Contributions for 1882 -	1,191,175
	<hr/> <hr/>

A somewhat similar test is found in the Collections on Hospital Sunday in the Metropolis. In 1882 (See *National Church* p. 29, 1883) the sums collected at the various places of worship in London amounted to £31,944 18s. 8d, of which more than three-fourths were contributed by the Church of England. The five highest amounts were as follows :

Church of England - - - -	£24,496 19 1
Congregationalists - - - -	2,099 15 4
Baptists - - - -	1,162 19 3
Wesleyans - - - -	984 13 1
Jews - - - -	983 19 0

The proportions of contributions in the previous year (1881) were as nearly as possible the same.

Interesting statistics of a different kind, bearing on the subject, will be found in *Three Essays (A Census of Religions, Denominational Worship, The National Church)* by the Rt. Hon. J. G. Hubbard (Longmans, 1882). These Essays should be read by every one interested in the subject. I quote from p. 17 sq. :

‘We turn for our denominational statistics to the year 1870. Owing to the subsequent fusion of denominations in School Boards, that is the latest date at which would be found official returns of

the religious classification of the children attending primary Schools. In the year 1870, according to the Education Department, there were under inspection in the primary Schools 1,434,765 children, of whom 72·6 per 100 were in Church Schools.'

'Of 190,054 Marriages in 1878, 72·6 per 100 were of the Church.'

'Of 32,361 Seamen and Mariners employed in 1875, the percentage of Churchmen was 75·5.'

'The army of 183,024 men, having in 1870 as many as 24·0 per 100 Roman Catholics, still showed a proportion of Churchmen equal to 62·5 per cent.'

'Of 101,458 adult inmates of workhouses in 1875, the proportion of Church people was 79 per cent.'

'Of 22,677 prisoners in gaol in 1867, the proportion returned as Churchmen was 75 per 100.'

'The number of Nonconformist Chapels supplied to Dr. Mann contrasts strangely with the number of 'Ministers' recorded in the enumerated Professions of the Official Census of 1851. In that Report the Clergy of the Church are stated at 17,320, and the Ministers of all other denominations at 8,658 [while the number of Churches is 14,077 and the number of Nonconformist Chapels 20,390].'

'One expects to find some proportion between the number of the shepherds and the number of the folds into which they gather their sheep; but while the Clergy considerably exceeded in number the Churches in which they officiated, Nonconformist Ministers of all sects do not in number equal one-half of the buildings which are said to have been provided for them and are appealed to as an evidence of progress.'

The discrepancy is explained by the fact that among registered Nonconformist places of worship are included Music-halls, Assembly Rooms, rooms in hotels, even private dwelling-houses, where worship is conducted. Illustrations are given by Mr. Hubbard (p. 15, sq.) and more fully in *The Englishman's Brief on behalf of his National Church* (Appendix C) p. 188 sq., a work published by the S.P.C.K., and well worthy of attention.

Again; the statistics of Schools, before and after the passing of the Education Act in 1870, are highly instructive:

Voluntary Expenditure on Church Schools and Training Colleges.

	FROM 1811 TO 1870.	SINCE 1870.	TOTAL.
	£	£	£
Schools :			
Building - - -	6,270,577	5,333,595	11,604,172
Maintenance - - -	8,500,000	6,642,866	15,142,866
Training Colleges :			
Building - - -	194,085	77,100	271,185
Maintenance - - -	185,276	176,631	361,907
	15,149,938	12,230,192	27,380,130

The amount of accommodation and average attendance in Church and other Schools during the last three years also deserves attention :

Accommodation.

DAY SCHOOLS, YEAR ENDED AUGUST 31.	1880.	1881.	1882.
Church - - - -	2,327,379	2,351,235	2,385,374
British, &c. - - -	386,034	384,905	384,060
Wesleyan - - -	196,566	197,871	200,909
Roman Catholic - - -	248,140	261,354	269,231
Board - - - -	1,082,634	1,194,268	1,298,746
	4,240,753	4,389,633	4,538,320

Average Attendance.

DAY SCHOOLS, YEAR ENDED AUGUST 31.	1880.	1881.	1882.
Church - - - -	1,471,615	1,490,429	1,538,408
British, &c. - - -	243,012	243,747	245,493
Wesleyan - - -	121,408	120,366	125,109
Roman Catholic - - -	145,629	152,642	160,910
Board - - - -	769,252	856,351	945,231
	2,750,916	2,863,535	3,015,151

These School statistics are taken from the Report of the *National Education Society* (1883). When it is remembered that Churchmen, besides maintaining their own Schools, are charged with rates for the support of the Board Schools, these statistics will be seen to be highly significant.

NOTE 22, p. 61.

My remarks on the working of the Burials Act have called forth comments from Archdeacon Harrison in Note A to his *Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Maidstone, May 1882* (Rivingtons, 1883), to which I would wish to direct attention. His extracts from the evidence given before the Select Committee of the House of Commons well deserve study.

NOTE 23, p. 67.

Since this charge was delivered, the question of the permanent diaconate has been widely discussed. The measure seems to be regarded with growing favour; but I cannot say that my misgivings are overcome. If adopted, I trust it will be worked with caution.

NOTE 24, p. 77.

The publications which reflect the subsequent career and aims of the Salvation Army are *The Salvation War 1882, under the Generalship of William Booth*, and *The Salvation Army in relation to the Church and State* by Mrs. Booth. In his latter work the writer continues to express the same friendly feelings towards 'the Churches' (see especially p. 44). Yet, as a matter of fact, where attempts have been made on the part of clergy of the Church of England to provide instruction and opportunities of worship to members of the Salvation Army, they have been frustrated by the rigid exigencies of the 'Army' discipline. The Army has practically become a sect, though its leaders may still in theory disclaim his position. Meanwhile its appeal to sensation has not abated.

NOTE 25, p. 82.

On the subject of the authorization of King James's Version see a valuable paper by the Rev. R. T. Davidson (now Dean of Windsor) in *Macmillan's Magazine*, October 1881.

NOTE 26, p. 84.

An important recent contribution to the Vestments Controversy is *The Church and the Ornaments Rubric* by E. B. Wheatley Balme,

M.A. Even those, who are not able to accept all the author's results, will (I venture to think) feel that the subject is discussed with singular clearness and point.

NOTE 27, p. 89.

In the Charge, as delivered, I had spoken of Mr. Green's 'resignation.' Finding that inferences were drawn from the use of the word which I had not intended, I have altered the expression for publication.

The publication of this charge has been long postponed in the hope that I might be able to supplement it with copious notes, discussing at length the questions touched upon in the second part. But the exigencies of other more important work have interposed from time to time, and prevented the realization of this hope. Without any further delay therefore it is published in the form in which it was delivered with the exception of a verbal alteration here and there.





