9/4

RELIGIO LAICI

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Spectator.—'A book which every reader will enjoy.'

Crown 8vo, 6*s*.

CONFERENCES ON BOOKS AND MEN.

Reprinted from the *Cornhill Magazine.*

Manchester Courier.—'A treasure-house of good things.'

FOURTH EDITION. Crown 8vo, 6*s*.

PAGES FROM A PRIVATE DIARY.

Reprinted from the *Cornhill Magazine.*

RELIGIO LAICI

A SERIES OF STUDIES ADDRESSED TO LAYMEN

BY THE REV.

H. C. BEECHING, M.A.

PROFESSOR OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY AT KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON, AND CHAPLAIN TO THE HON. SOC. OF LINCOLN'S INN

LONDON

SMITH, ELDER & CO., 15, WATERLOO PLACE

1902

PRINTED BY
WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
LONDON AND BECCLES.

REVERENDISSIMO PATRI

CAROLO

DN̄O EPISCOPO WIGORNIENSI

QUO NEMO MAGIS ADFIRMAVIT

IURA RELIGIONIS,

LAICORUM PRIVILEGIA

HUNC DE RELIGIONE LAICI LIBELLUM

AMICUS AUCTOR

PREFACE.

In writing these papers at various times during the past five years, I have had in view not the trained thinker and theologian, but such persons of general intelligence and education as tend to create the main body of opinion about religious matters; in a word, the readers of the weekly and monthly reviews. The arguments they contain are aimed at certain prejudices that I have heard expressed in conversation, or that seem to be implied in the attitude of such persons to current views and controversies. Thus the first essay endeavours to meet the too prevalent idea that Christianity is nothing but a refined system of morals, a new Stoicism "touched with emotion," upon which the clergy have grafted an alien and unnecessary system of dogmas. The second attempts to define and defend the special characteristics of the Church of England among other religious bodies. As an appendix to that, I have added a paper written as a protest against an attack made—of course, in good faith—by two well-known men of letters upon the reputation of one of our most famous Jacobean divines and one of our best-loved and most typical seventeenth-century laymen.

In the fourth essay I have drawn out, as clearly as I could, the indictment that "the man in the street" is apt to prefer against the clerical order, urging in reply what apology seemed possible; and I have supplemented this, in the fifth, by a general defence of modern clerical ideals in England. Finally, I have ventured to address an appeal to the laity for further consideration of three questions that are crying out for wise settlement—the financial position of the clergy, the controversy about ritual, and the place of religion in elementary education.

Several of the essays have appeared already in magazines, and I have to thank the editors of the *National Review*, the *Monthly Review*, and the *Cornhill Magazine* for leave to reprint them. The essay on the English Church was contributed to a volume called "Church Problems," edited by Canon Hensley Henson, and published by Mr. Murray, to whom a similar acknowledgment is due. In re-issuing these, and adding those that appear for the first time, I may be allowed to express the hope that they will help in a humble way towards that wise and steady judgment in matters of religion which cannot be reached without patient thought and the abandonment of superficial prejudice.

H. C. BEECHING.

KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON,
January 1, 1902.

CONTENTS.

CHRISTIANITY AND STOICISM

CHRISTIANITY AND STOICISM.

THE question is always being asked nowadays, and it cannot fail to be worth asking, What precisely does the world owe to Christianity? Homilists are apt to answer the question by exhibiting a picture of Roman manners in the first century, drawn from the highly coloured pages of Juvenal, and bringing into contrast with it the lovely scene of Christian worship and brotherly love, as we find it, for the first time, in the record of Justin Martyr. But to go to Juvenal for a general picture of first-century morals is, as Renan reminds us, like going for a picture of the seventeenth century to Mathurin Regnier and Boileau.[1] And we may remind ourselves that Christian England, no less than Christian France, has had its satirists. It is far more instructive to look at decaying Paganism on its brightest side, not in the vices of Nero, but in the virtues of his victims, of his wife Octavia, his tutor Seneca, and the long line of martyrs that live in the pages of Tacitus; again, not in the wild Persian and

[1] *Les Apôtres*, p. 307, *note*.

Cappadocian mysteries of Ma and Mithra which flowed into Tiber from the Orontes, but in the crabbed protests of Persius, the austere self-discipline of Epictetus, the passionate aspiration of Marcus Aurelius.

In the chapter of *Les Apôtres* already referred to, Renan collects from Pliny and Suetonius many touching examples of domestic virtue and chivalrous honour. "Wives accompanied their husbands into exile, others shared their noble deaths. The ancient Roman simplicity was not lost; the education of children was painstaking and serious. . . . In the majority of the provinces there was a middle class, where goodness, probity, conjugal fidelity were widely spread;" and he waxes eloquent over the bourgeois *bonhomie* and sweetness of Plutarch's life at Chæronea. Moreover, philanthropy was cultivated; "care for the poor, universal sympathy, almsgiving had become virtues."[1] Again, he points out that although paternal legislation, as we might call it, did not flourish to any great extent till Nerva and Trajan, there was already in the first century, even in hard-hearted Rome, help given to children, distribution of food, etc., while in the East charitable relief was more or less organized. What was good and growing better in this Roman world came undoubtedly from the Stoics, who were the first school of moralists to

[1] He quotes such epitaphs as "hominis boni, misericordis, amantis pauperes," which at any rate prove an ideal.

bring Greek philosophy home to the business and conscience of mankind. The great Greek moral philosophers, Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, had finally and once for all established the truth that "the good" of which mankind was in search was, in fact, "goodness;" showing itself on this and that occasion, now as fortitude, now as temperance, now as justice; but being in every case not something exterior to the man, but simply the full and free exercise of the faculties of his soul in human society. But the Stoics, partly from the circumstances of their age, which after the conquests of Alexander left little scope for active political life, partly from the fact that the founders of the school were not Greek but Semite, gave the preponderance in their system to the inner life of the individual soul, and thus introduced a new degree of earnestness. Let us shortly sum up the religious ideas of the Stoics at their best, leaving aside the mere paradoxes and formulæ at which genial satirists like Horace found it easy enough to raise a laugh; in this way we shall best see how far it fell short, if fall short it did, of the religion founded by Christ.

1. The first note of Stoicism was its *inwardness;* it threw a man back on what he was in himself, and, like King Lear, regarded all else as "lendings." The Stoics drew a distinction between things in a man's power and things not in his power: in his power was the *will* and all that the will implied;

beyond his power were such external things as accidents to the body, fame, wealth, etc., which, because they were beyond his power, were therefore to be beyond his interest. A wise man would withdraw his care from such indefensible outworks, and concentrate himself in his impregnable citadel. Happiness, they said, must not be suffered to depend upon what chance can remove ; virtue alone is happiness. The Church historian Eusebius thus states this doctrine, which he terms "divine:" "Virtue is a thing strong and exquisitely fair, never lacking anything for happiness, never parted from it; but though poverty, disease, disgrace, torments, burning pitch, and the cross, and all sufferings of tragedy should pour upon him at once, still the just man is happy and blessed." We cannot but share Eusebius's enthusiasm ; for the paradox that virtue is happiness, that the just man though poor is yet alone rich, though a slave is yet alone free and a king, has been familiar to us from childhood in the pages of St. Paul, who borrowed it from the Stoics.[1] And just as St. Paul pointed to the pattern of his Master, so the Stoics pointed to Heracles, a son of Zeus, and asked if a god despised pleasures and undertook so

[1] St. Paul, who was born at Tarsus, a chief seat of the Stoical philosophy, uses their technical term *self-sufficingness* (αὐτάρκεια). "I have learned," he writes to the Philippians (iv. 11), "in whatsoever state I am, therein to be self-sufficing;" and to the Corinthians, "In everything always having all self-sufficiency" (2 Cor. ix. 8). See Lightfoot's *Philippians, St. Paul and Seneca*, p. 303.

many labours for our sake, whether pain and poverty could be reckoned undivine.

2. A second great conception of Stoicism was that of *moral progress* by the exertion of the will. It followed from this that the Stoics were the great educators of antiquity. It became the fashion at the close of the Republic and under the Empire for the great Roman houses to have a Stoic philosopher in their service, much as great Roman Catholic houses have their confessor, and great Protestant houses their chaplain. Such was Athenodorus in the house of Cato the younger; another Athenodorus, author of a book "with an eminently Stoical title, *Earnestness and Education*,"[1] was invited to Rome by Augustus and appointed tutor to the young Claudius; Seneca himself was tutor to the young Nero. It is in the voluminous letters of Seneca that we find this idea of moral progress most fully developed and exemplified. Seneca is for ever analyzing his conduct, now blaming his failures, now cheered by some success, and no less of course stimulating his correspondent Lucilius to persevere along the difficult road. "I myself so immoderately wept for Annæus Serenus that I must rank among the bad examples of those who have been overcome by grief" (63). "I have made but little progress as yet; I dare not yet openly assume frugality. I mind the opinions of

[1] Grant's *Ethics of Aristotle*, vol. i. p. 344, from which several quotations are borrowed.

passers-by" (87). "It is a great part of advance to will to be advancing. Of this I am conscious to myself; I will to advance; nay, I will it with my whole heart" (71). In his treatise "On Anger" (iii. 36) he relates his practice, after the example of Sextius, in the matter of self-examination: "We ought each day to call upon our soul to give up its accounts. So Sextius did. His day ended, before surrendering himself to repose, he would inquire of his soul: Of what fault hast thou this day been healed? What passion hast thou subdued? In what art thou better? . . . What is more comely than this habit of thus reviewing the whole day? What sleep surpasses that so won? So calm it is, so deep, so free when the soul has borne her secret witness and submitted to her judgment in praise or blame. Thus do I myself, and call myself before my own judgment-seat. When the light has been removed from my chamber I pass under review my whole day with its words and deeds. I blink no unpleasant fact, I pass nothing over. For why should I fear to face any one of my faults when it lies in my power to say, 'For to-day I pardon thee; but sin no more'?" This idea of self-examination does not play much part in the writings of St. Paul, for reasons that we shall better understand presently, but he uses the technical word for "progress" (προκοπή), and expresses the idea, very much as Seneca does, in such passages as the following: "Not that I have already attained

but I follow after. One thing I do; I press forward."

3. If we examine the catalogues of virtues in which progress is to be made, we find them not unlike those with which we are familiar in St. Paul's epistles. "Speak to me," says Seneca, "of piety, of justice, of temperance, of chastity." "This is the road to heaven, frugality, temperance, resignation." "Keep thyself," says Marcus Aurelius, "simple, good, pure, serious, free from affectation, a friend of justice, a worshipper of the gods, kind, affectionate, strenuous in all proper acts." "I have found nothing better in life than justice, truth, temperance, fortitude." "Show the qualities thou hast in thy power, sincerity, gravity, endurance of labour, aversion to pleasure, contentment with thy fortune and with few things, benevolence, frankness, no love of superfluity, freedom from trifling, magnanimity." "The only thing worth living for is to keep one's soul pure." Nor is that peculiarly Christian virtue of forgiveness lacking. "You do not love men; it is not enough to pardon them. You must love those who injure you. Against injury and ingratitude God has given you the power of sweetness."

4. Another notable Stoic conception was that of the "city of God," which dissolved all earthly distinctions, and included among its citizens barbarian and Scythian, bond and free. When we recollect that the founder of Stoicism was contemporary with

Alexander the Great, we shall understand how the idea of "a citizen of the world" could spring up owing to the absorption of the small independent Greek states into the one kingdom of Macedon; while the still more majestic unity of the Roman Empire gave it, as years went on, a still more perfect realization. We smile at the glibness with which the old gentleman in the Terentian comedy excuses his curiosity on the plea of his universalism: "I am a man, and so take an interest in everything human;" but that Græco-Roman universalism was a pregnant idea, capable of bearing fruit on many other sides than that of curiosity. It was, however, more than a kingdom of Man in which the Stoics declared each man to be a citizen; it was a kingdom of God. The will of God was to them the one law of the world; to discover this will and submit to it must be the whole duty of man, because man is the "child of God," and in such submission man finds perfect freedom. This idea of equal citizenship in the one divine kingdom necessarily brought with it the idea of mutual service—in a word, of charity. And so we find Seneca laying it down: "Nature bids us assist men; and whether they be bond or free, gentle or freedmen, what matters it? Wherever there is a *man* there is opportunity for doing good" (*De Vit. Beata*, ii. 24). Again: "What is a Roman knight, or a freedman, or a slave, but names born of ambition or injustice?" (Ep. 31). The idea finds abundant

illustration in the "Meditations" of Marcus Aurelius: "The poet says 'dear city of Cecrops;' shall I not say 'dear city of God'?"

How St. Paul caught up and gloried in this idea of a "city of God" is well known. "Our citizenship is in heaven." "Therefore ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but fellow-citizens of the saints, and of the household of God." "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."

5. The idea of a "city of God," interpreted, as the Stoics interpreted it, of the whole universe, seemed sometimes to bring with it the doctrine of immortality. Thus Seneca writes of death as "a day when his soul delivered from the prison of the body shall return to God who gave it;" of the future life as "a state in which all secrets of nature shall be revealed, and friends know each other and be happy." But he is not always so hopeful, sometimes he vacillates: "Death is either an end or a transition; it must be a gain or nothing;" and sometimes he despairs. In fact, this doctrine of immortality brings us for the first time to a sharp contrast between Stoical and Christian ideas. When St. Paul preached at Athens, he pursued his usual custom of being all things to all men for the sake of winning some, and went as far as he could on Stoical lines, quoting their great poet Cleanthes, or perhaps Aratus, and carrying his

audience with him in his denouncement of popular idolatry and his exposition of the providence of God; but when he spoke of the resurrection of the dead some mocked (perhaps, but not necessarily, the Epicureans), others said, "We will hear thee again on this matter." For this was a question on which there was difference of opinion. The better minds revolted from the uncompromising tenets of the founders of the faith. Stoicism was in its origin a materialistic pantheism; the supreme principle was fire, and back again into this fire must all things be once more resolved. To speak of a second life was absurd: the most that was possible was a longer interval for the elect before the final cataclysm. But as Stoicism became more and more a force in the world it became more and more eclectic, and the best of its borrowings was that of the soul's immortality from Plato. It was Plato's "Phædo," not a Stoical treatise, that Cato read at Utica before his suicide. Still the doctrine never became a necessary part of Stoicism. Epictetus surrendered it: "Come, but whither? To nothing dreadful, but only to what is near and dear to thee, to the elements from which thou hast sprung" (iii. 13, 14). And Marcus Aurelius follows Epictetus: "Thou hast existed as part of a whole; thou wilt be absorbed into that which gave thee birth."

St. Paul laid his finger on the weak place of Stoicism when he took for his text the inscription

he had seen upon an altar, "To the unknown God." It is true that the Stoical writings abound with pious phrases which at the first glance seem to be borrowed from some Christian manual, but on nearer acquaintance we discover that the resemblance is illusory. "God is near thee," writes Seneca, "nay with thee, nay within thee; no one is good without God" (Ep. 41). "God is author of all; obey him without murmuring" (Ep. 107). "It is not that I obey God only. I agree with him, following him not of necessity but gladly; if such be the will of God, so be it." Occasionally this acquiescence becomes even passionate. "What can I do," says Epictetus, "I old and lame, if it be not to praise God? If I were a nightingale, I would do a nightingale's part; if I were a swan, a swan's part. I am a rational creature, therefore I must praise God" (Disc. i. 16). But the God they worshipped, or spoke of worshipping, was merely Nature; God's will was but a devout name for the ascertained laws of the universe, which will take their course irrespective of our concurrence, but which it is the part of a wise man to concur with. This concurrence is possible because God is no abstract law but the spirit of the universe pervading all things, and man in a special sense, inasmuch as man alone of the creatures shares in reason; hence man, being a fragment of God, "God's offspring," can and should co-operate with God. But it is plain that if on this theory it is meet and right to worship God, it is no

less meet and right to worship one's self. God is great and man is little, "a piece of him," but there the difference ends. And so, as a matter of fact, the worship a Stoic offered to God was no different *in kind* from the respect he paid to the leaders of his own sect. It was a saying of Sextius which Seneca quotes with approval that God is not better than a good man; he is but richer and longer-lived (Ep. 73).

Now, Christianity meant primarily a revelation of God. "Whom ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you." And if we may believe the Church, which Christ founded to be a witness to Him, His good news for mankind consisted in the declaration of the fact that there was an *only-born* Son in the bosom of God, and that He had become incarnate; facts which entailed a multitude of consequences for thought, and three pre-eminently—first, that inasmuch as in the Godhead itself there existed a Son, God is essentially "the Father," essentially "Love;" secondly, that as God existed before all worlds, a self-conscious Mind, not requiring the universe as the object of His love and thought, man is no part of God, but a *creature*, though made "in God's image;" and, thirdly, that as the Son could take flesh, the whole of human nature could be lifted up into the spirit of Sonship. These are the root-ideas of Christianity, and it is not difficult to see of what immense force they are capable. To be

convinced that God is, that He is not "the shade cast by the soul of man," or the conjectured Whole of which man is a part; to be convinced that in His proper nature He is "Love and nothing but Love," love given and returned; finally, to be convinced that at a certain point of time the Son came into the world to show men the Father and to share with men this spirit of love to the Father, man having by birthright a certain freedom of will—these are ideas that cannot be entertained without making a revolution in men's lives—as, in fact, they did, and do.

But, it may be said, these are not religious but theological ideas, and the public has been taught of late by popular essayists and novelists to distrust such ideas. Is not Christianity something altogether simpler than this? Have not all dogmas been successfully dissolved by literary tact? Is not religion just "morality touched with emotion," just precepts of good living, only "heightened and lit up by feeling"? Well, that Stoicism answered more or less to this description we have already seen; it was a system of morals that at times put on an emotional dress and masqueraded as a religion, and by stripping off this dress we lose no characteristic feature: we lose only that curious dream,

> "pénible à concevoir,
> Gênante pour le cœur comme pour la cervelle,
> Que l'Univers, le Tout, soit Dieu sans le savoir."[1]

[1] Sully-Prudhomme, *Les Epreuves*.

And it may be so also with Christianity. But then the fact must not be dogmatically asserted; it must be demonstrated either from the present faith and worship of the Church, which is obviously impossible, or from the earliest records. Now, the most remarkable feature of Christ's teaching as exhibited in the Gospels is that He professed to bring a new revelation of the nature of God. This revelation He summed up in the word "Father," not using that word in the conventional sense of "creator," in which it is common to all religions, but in a sense from which could be inferred all manner of loving-kindness. "If ye, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your *Father in heaven* give good gifts to them that ask Him?" "But when he was yet a great way off, his *father* saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him." And the name is solemnly employed in the prescribed prayer. But it was not a mere name or definition that Christ came to reveal, but a character, and this character was to be seen in Himself. He declared Himself to be in some unique sense the *Son* of God, who was alone capable from his intimate knowledge of revealing the Father. "All things are given unto Me of My Father, and no man knoweth the Son save the Father, neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." "Come unto Me, and I will give you rest." "I and the

Father are one." "I am come that they may have life, and may have it abundantly; and this is life eternal, to know Thee the only true God." It is incredible that any one reading these passages, and there are many others like them, could imagine that a Christianity which denied that Christ came from the Father with a revelation of His character, could remain Christianity at all. But Christ Himself puts the matter in plain terms: "I am come in My Father's name, and ye receive Me not. If another should come in his own name, him ye would receive;" and it was of course this claim to be Son and Revealer of God in a unique sense which provoked the fury of the Jews and led to the crucifixion. Moreover, if Christ were merely the preacher of morality that Mr. Matthew Arnold declares Him to have been, what becomes of the question at Cæsarea Philippi—that Great Divide in the life of Christ—the answer to which was the foundation-stone of the Church? "*Who say ye that I am?*" Mr. Arnold, so far as I know, ignores the question. But it cuts the ground away from his position that Christ called Himself by any or all of the current names for the Messiah with perfect indifference, because He wanted to interest people not in theology which would do them no good, but in morality. To Mr. Arnold, God is not a "person"[1] at all who can be known,

[1] Theological terms can always be made to seem ridiculous if they are not explained, and this term of "Person" as applied to God—

and therefore, if Jesus said He came to reveal Him, He could not have meant what He said; He was speaking in a popular way, and meant He had come to give improved moral laws. For when the Jews said "God," all they meant was the law of their being at its best, the better self in all the nation; it was language "thrown out at a not fully grasped object of the speaker's consciousness." It is enough to say here that there is no sign in the Bible that either the Jews or Jesus Christ ever used the word God in any such way.

Let us now proceed to examine shortly what difference Christianity makes to the Stoical ideas described above.

1. We saw that the first note of Stoicism was its

"the blessed truth that God is a Person"—has provoked the hilarity of Mr. Arnold and perhaps of some of his readers. But if religion is to mean what to ordinary people it does mean, it cannot exclude worship, and worship must have a possible object, and no God is possible for man who is not Mind and Will, *i.e.* "Personal." Any one who is interested in Mr. Arnold as a theologian and in his description of God as a stream of tendency making for righteousness, will find some criticisms in Mr. F. H. Bradley's *Ethical Studies*, p. 284. Here only one sentence can be quoted: "'Is there a God?' asks the reader. 'Oh yes,' replies Mr. Arnold, 'and I can verify Him in experience.' 'And what is He, then?' cries the reader. 'Be virtuous, and as a rule you will be happy,' is the answer. 'Well, and God?' 'That is God,' says Mr. Arnold; 'there is no deception, and what more do you want?' I suppose we do want a good deal more. Most of us . . . want something they can worship; and they will not find that in an hypostatized copy-book heading, which is not much more adorable than 'Honesty is the best policy,' or 'Handsome is that handsome does,' or various other edifying maxims, which have not yet come to an apotheosis."

inwardness, its care for inward thoughts and motives. Now, Mr. Arnold, following up his idea that Christianity is only Stoicism "touched with emotion," makes this inwardness "the essence of Christianity," "the very ground-principle in Jesus Christ's teaching."[1] But every moral teacher must lay stress on the motives and thoughts; and to seek here the essence of Christianity is to seek it in what is common to all advanced schools of ethics. So soon as we look at the special mark of the Stoic inwardness, its principle of self-sufficingness, we are at once reminded by contrast of as definite a principle of Christianity which directly conflicts with it. It is not only that Stoicism tended to arrogance, while Christ enjoined humility. Too much, perhaps, has been made of the Stoic arrogance; after all, arrogance is less a matter of system than of individual temper; and we cannot accuse of it either Marcus Aurelius or Thraseas, whom Tacitus describes as "gentle, modest, fearing to hate vice too much lest he should hate men." A more real difference is that Stoicism is a principle of self-absorption, while Christianity bids men "lift up their hearts to the Lord." Let us look at Mr. Arnold's thesis in its more expanded form. He speaks of Christ's *method* of "self-examination," His *secret* of "self-renouncement," the *element* of "mildness" in which He worked. "*Self-examination, self-renouncement*, and *mildness* were the great means by which

[1] *Literature and Dogma*, pp. 63, 65, Pop. Ed.

Jesus Christ renewed righteousness and religion."[1] The three words have certainly all of them a religious sound, but the perspective seems wrong; the stress is laid in the wrong place; they leave out of sight the fact that Christ came, according to His own statement, to recall men to God by calling them to Himself. If we take our Christianity from the New Testament, for *self-examination* we must read "trust in God," for *self-renouncement* we must read "devotion to Christ's service," for *mildness* it would be safer to read the "spirit of the Son," the filial spirit of love and worship to the Heavenly Father.

As to self-examination, it will be allowed that there are precepts which make it a part of Christian duty. But the main direction of Christ's teaching is to urge that the soul's rest comes not from self-occupation, but from faith in God; that what we can do for ourselves is as nothing compared with what God can do for us. "I would have you without carefulness." "Which of you by care can add a cubit to his stature?" The gradual change that came over the eleven chosen disciples was not the result of introspection, but of living with their Master, talking to Him, seeing Him work and pray, bringing Him their difficulties, pondering the words of truth that came as the answer to their thoughts. Their desires grew divine because they were "lift upward." To quote Mr. Arnold himself, it was "no

[1] *Literature and Dogma*, p. 68.

grand performance or discovery of a man's own to bring him thus to joy and peace, but an attachment! the influence of *One full of grace and truth!*"[1] Surely this is a truer description of Christ's method than "self-examination." What Christ sought everywhere was "faith," faith in Himself; and where He found faith, though quite in germ and undeveloped, He pronounced all things to be possible. For trust and love are the great conductors of influence. To take but one instance from the sacred story. Who will deny that the poor woman who threw herself at the feet of Christ in Simon's house saw herself in all the naked deformity of her sin? But how did she reach her penitence? Was it by a long process of self-examination? We know that it was by attraction to Christ. How the attraction befell we are not told, but her faith, however kindled, soon flamed into a passionate love, which lit up her past dark life in its true colours, and made her seek forgiveness. The second characteristic of Christianity, its "secret" according to Mr. Arnold, is *self-renouncement.* Here again the word has a Christian sound, and we are tempted to accept it without challenge; but the array of maxims from pagan writers by which its validity is supported gives us pause. To be told that "self-renouncement" was equally the secret of Stobæus, of Horace, and of Goethe, makes us a little incredulous of its being peculiarly Christian, and it is not easy to

[1] *Literature and Dogma*, p. 146.

understand how a secret so widely diffused can be a secret at all. On examination it proves to be nothing more than the discovery, as old as morality itself, that if a man wishes in any matter to do right he must surrender the pleasure of doing wrong. But what Christ meant when He said, "If any man will come after Me, let him deny (or renounce) himself and follow Me," was that following Him would certainly lead to persecution and death, but that death need not be feared because beyond it lay everlasting life. Here, too, the precept was as little self-regarding as possible; the attention is fixed not on one's self, but on Christ, not on the death that is to be despised, but on the immortality beyond. And the same is true of all Christ's precepts about what is now called "self-denial." Self-denial is only a secondary consideration to the following of Christ, a necessary incident in self-devotion, but not to be considered apart from it, and not to be magnified above it. To preach "self-denial" as a peculiar doctrine of Christianity is to err by a false abstractness; such denial in itself is well characterized by St. Paul;[1] it is valuable only in view of some paramount object of desire. In the same way Christianity did not affront experience by saying, as the Stoics said, "The just man is happy in himself, whatever happens;" it said, "He who believes in God, he who has Christ for his master, he who carries about with him the Paraclete, is happy,

[1] Col. ii. 23.

whatever happens." When St. Paul speaks of self-sufficingness, it is with the significant addition, "I can do all things *through Christ which strengtheneth me*," "*God is able* to make all grace abound to you"—an addition of something more than emotion. Mr. Arnold's third term is "mildness." This seems to err in the same way through abstractness. Christ described Himself as "meek" (or "*mild*") and "lowly in heart" under the yoke of God's service, because God was His Father; so that the temper He requires in His followers would be better described as *the filial spirit*—the spirit of trust and reverence and love to God, made possible by the gift to men of the spirit of the only Son. The "element" in which Christ moved was really not an element of "mildness"—unless that word can be extended to include fierce rebuke and anger—but it was pre-eminently an element of obedience, of devotion, of prayer. "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work." "Jesus continued all night in prayer to God."

2. The second great Stoical idea, that of moral progress by the exercise of the will, is one that Christianity cannot fail to acknowledge as true, so far as it goes; but taken alone for the whole truth, it was found necessary to brand it as heresy. The will must be put forth if progress is to be made; but the will, according to Christianity, works in a divine medium, which at a wish can react upon it. And the Christian

faith has addressed itself especially to weak wills; it says to them, "Wilt thou be made whole?" "Believe; all things are possible to them that believe."

3. If the position taken up in this paper be admitted, viz. that the revelation given by Jesus Christ was theological and dynamic rather than moral—that is to say, that it professed to give men for the first time certainty as to the nature of God, a confirmation of the truths that the Word had whispered in men's hearts since the beginning of the world, together with a new spring of life to carry them into active realization—it will not be anticipated that the Christian virtues will add much in their number or definition to those already given from the Stoics. And we have seen that the lists closely agree. True it is that we have seen "the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ," and that must give a peculiar depth and intensity to what we mean by love and meekness and forgiveness; but we dare not pretend that these Christian virtues are different in kind from those so ardently desired by the Stoic emperor. The motives, however, will be new; the range of exercise will be wider; and the possibility of fulfilling them will be enormously increased. Moreover, they will be seen to rest in what is their proper ground, the character of God. And does not this make a difference? In his essay on Marcus Aurelius, Mr. Arnold takes the great doctrine of forgiveness, and asks why it became more effective from the lips

of Jesus than from Epictetus, and he gives his usual answer that it was due to the "emotion" with which the former presented it. "Epictetus says: 'Every matter has two handles, one of which will bear taking hold of, the other not. If thy brother sin against thee, lay not hold of the matter by this, that he sins against thee; for by this handle the matter will not bear taking hold of. But rather lay hold of it by this, that he is thy brother, thy born mate; and thou wilt take hold of it by what will bear handling.' Jesus, being asked whether a man is bound to forgive his brother as often as seven times, answers: 'I say not unto thee, Until seven times: but, Until seventy times seven.' Epictetus here suggests to the reason grounds for forgiveness of injuries which Jesus does not; but it is vain to say that Epictetus is on that account a better moralist than Jesus, if the *warmth*, the *emotion* of Jesus's answer fires His hearer to the practice of forgiveness of injuries, while the thought in Epictetus's leaves him cold. So with Christian morality in general: its distinction is not that it propounds the maxim, 'Thou shalt love God and thy neighbour,' with more development, closer reasoning, truer sincerity, than other moral systems; it is that it propounds this maxim with an inspiration which wonderfully catches the hearer and makes him act upon it. . . . That which gives to the moral writings of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius their peculiar character and charm is their being *suffused* and

softened by something of the very *sentiment whence Christian morality draws its best power.*" Of the question whether there is more warmth and emotion in the one sentence than the other, Mr. Arnold, with his exquisite sense of style, was probably a better judge than most of us, but that Jesus did not trust to any such sentimental efficacy in His words any reader may assure himself who will be at the pains to refer to the passage in St. Matthew's Gospel (xviii. 20) from which the sentence is quoted. He will see that our Lord at once follows up His moral dictum by the parable of the Two Debtors, which rests the case for forgiveness on the ground of our having been freely forgiven by God an intolerable debt. "O thou wicked servant, I forgave thee all that debt, because thou desiredst Me: shouldest not thou also have had compassion on thy fellow servant, even as I had pity on thee? . . . So likewise shall My heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses." The motive here is plain: Be ye therefore merciful, *as your Father in heaven is merciful.* It must be noted also under this head that, though the Stoics *speak* not of faults only but of sins, a term which implies a righteous will that has been disobeyed, the sense of sin in the world has been immeasurably deepened since the cross of Christ has been accepted as the witness at once to the power of sin and the love of God.

4. The idea of the "city of God" is one of the noblest in antiquity, but it remained an idea, barren and inoperative, until the Christian Church gave it form and reality. Seneca may have dined with his slaves; Epictetus, himself a slave, had little influence in the world and little chance of making his ideas tell; with Marcus Aurelius the dream of Plato was fulfilled, and a philosopher became king, and no doubt he succeeded in making converts among his courtiers; but though he may thus have opened the gates of a city, it suffered no violence from the press of those who thronged into it; the masses received no invitation and remained outside. "Men exist for the sake of one another, teach them and bear with them;" will the masses not be attracted by teaching and forbearance? "It is a satisfaction to a man to do the proper works of a man; now it is a proper work of a man to be benevolent to his own kind." Will not the masses, then, consent to allow the emperor to do towards them the proper works of a man? Will they not themselves realize their own proper manhood in benevolence to each other? "Alas!" cries the emperor, "who can change men's principles?" "Come quick," he cries, "O death, lest I should become like those!" Now hear Christ: "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to *give* you the kingdom." "Come unto Me, and I will *give* you rest." "*The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, for He has anointed Me to preach*

the gospel to the poor, He has sent Me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to release the bruised, to preach the year of the grace of the Lord—to-day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." Christ stands with hands outstretched, offering to all the world gifts from the Heavenly Father; He has gifts for all according to their need—forgiveness, healing, strength, life. "What wilt thou that I should do to thee?" "Behold, thou art made whole; sin no more, lest a worse thing come on thee." "Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit." "Daughter, be of good comfort; thy faith hath made thee whole." "If thou knewest the gift of God, thou wouldest have asked, and He would have given thee living water." To some it is said, "Ye would not come to Me, that ye might have life," but "to as many as received Him, He *gave power* to become the sons of God." He sends out into the highways and hedges and compels the beggars to come in to His feast; they are all to be admitted to free citizenship, to equal sonship. Why? Simply because the Father loves them. And so they come from the east and the west, the north and the south, and the publicans and harlots come before the Pharisees as having nothing of their own to surrender. The point to notice is the point St. Paul noticed, that it was "all of grace." The attracting call was the good news of God's fatherly love preached, and still more exhibited, by Christ; this and this only enabled

them to rise out of their fallen state, and love Christ in return ; then they were given the wedding garment of baptism, of regeneration, forgiveness of the past, and a new spring of hope, and so sat down to the feast which gave them strength for the new life in the new kingdom, the life of mutual love. The three words "in Christ Jesus," which in the quotation given above (p. 11) from St. Paul distinguish his heavenly city from that of the Stoics, made all the difference.

5. Lastly, there is the idea of immortality. In the Christian Church this passed from a faint hope, an esoteric mystery, into one of the most assured of certainties. St. Paul, at Athens, preached "Jesus and the Resurrection," Jesus who by His resurrection had brought life and immortality into the light of common day, and who had been signalized thereby as the very Son of God. It was the resurrection—a fact of which the apostles were witnesses, and which itself witnessed to their gospel—and not any body of moral notions, however excellent in themselves, and however emotionally presented,[1] that founded the Christian Church. For it restored to the disciples, and through them to the world, that figure, whom having once seen with their eyes, and handled with their hands, and loved with all their hearts, they

[1] "It may be remarked what a small part in the Divine economy the gift of eloquence plays. Moses had no utterance, the speech of Paul was contemptible, and the apostles can, indeed, say what needs saying, but have not the gift, so infinitely valued by the Greek, of leading men captive by persuasive words."—Latham, *Pastor Pastorum*, p. 250.

knew now to be seated at the right hand of God, gone to prepare a place for them, and yet by His Spirit always with them, as He had promised, even to the end of the world. It was one of the many practical paradoxes of Stoicism that while it professed to be happy here in despite of circumstances, it yet advocated and largely practised suicide, whereas on the contrary the Christian Church, which definitely proclaimed that its home was not here, but "above where Christ is," repudiated suicide as cowardice, and set about ordering life here; making, indeed, philanthropy a new thing by the extension given to it. This was because the "flaming ramparts of the world" had ceased to be ramparts at all; Christ and Christians were there as well as here, here as well as there. It was one kingdom though it embraced two worlds, and in which of the two worlds the individual Christian soldier was set to keep his guard or fight his fight depended not upon his inclination but upon his Captain's word.

The Christian religion, then, unlike Stoicism, centres in a divine Person. Its precepts of morality are excellent, its law of love to all mankind is such that it makes it possible and easy to keep them all—but how will it be found possible to keep the law of love? The answer is, through love to Christ. This, and not "inwardness," not "self-renouncement," was Christ's method and secret. We love Him because He first loved us, and in Him we love our brethren. We can

love them because we believe them to be made in His image, and capable of infinite degrees of approximation to His likeness ; but still more because it is His Spirit that both in them and in us strives with infirmity, is pleased with success or grieved at failure, and looks up to God the Father. But Christ as He is, not in us or our brethren, but in Himself, we not only love but worship, because His love that so wonderfully draws us is the love of God. Only it is well to be on our guard that in our worship we do not forget our love. If the worship of Christ becomes divorced from the recollection of what He was and therefore is, if it becomes the worship of a name emptied of everything but abstract qualities, it ceases to be worship at the same time that it ceases to be love.

THE SPIRIT OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH, AS EXHIBITED IN THE LITERATURE OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

THE SPIRIT OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH, AS EXHIBITED IN THE LITERATURE OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

MANY people must have felt that there is about the best religious writings of the Church of England a tone and temper proper to it, and distinguishable from those of other communions. Whether this temper can be precisely described as well as distinguished, whether in any attempted analysis so volatile a spirit would not escape, is another matter. The attempt at least to indicate it seems worth making, because at the present day there prevails in some quarters a disposition to deny to our Church any peculiar characteristics of its own, other than a certain cold formalism, due to its connection with the State; which Erastian coldness it is considered to be the duty of loyal Churchmen to qualify by an infusion from the literature and ritual of warmer climes. Against such ill-instructed loyalty the following pages may serve as a protest. Their aim is to call attention, in the literature of the great period when our Church started upon her independent

career, to the reasonable faith, the wide intellectual sympathy, the reserved enthusiasm, the reverent piety, which inspire those writings; qualities which were no merely accidental reaction against Romanism on the one hand and Puritanism on the other, though they define themselves constantly by reference to those, but an ideal that was framed by a study of Scripture and the primitive Church; and reflected as it was in the dignified simplicity of the reformed ritual, was found capable of satisfying the instinct alike for conduct, belief, and worship of the best Englishmen in that generation.

It was remarked many years ago by a writer in *Tracts for the Times*, that our English Prayer-book was pitched in a much more sober key than the Latin services from which it was compiled; and he hazarded the opinion that this was a providential disposition to adapt the Prayer-book to the days of the Anglican revival, when a graver and more penitential spirit was abroad in the churches. A simpler suggestion would be that at all times when the spirit of a Church is deeply stirred or comes to itself after a period of slumber, its mood is grave, and requires a serious expression; because, though "joy in the Lord" is beyond doubt the true expression of a Christian's perfected faith, there is a joy springing from much nearer the surface which may have to be sacrificed for the sake of what lies deeper. Selden tells us in the *Table Talk*, "There never was a merry

world since the parson left conjuring;" and it is not difficult to imagine how life, for all but the best spirits, might pass without anxiety if the only chance of things going wrong in the next world was a sudden death which would deprive the Churchman of the effectual ministrations of his priest *in articulo mortis*. The English race in the "ages of faith" was in its childhood, and it is natural to childhood to be merry and unconcerned. Writing on St. Nicholas' Day, I am reminded of that curious business, so incredible to us now, of the boy-bishop, which gave a note of gaiety, almost of farce, to what we now account the solemn season of Advent. The picturesque mummery must have served in its day some useful purpose, so far as the boys were concerned, or Colet would not have approved it in his statutes for St. Paul's School;[1] but its popularity clearly indicates the childish gaiety of the pre-Reformation religious spirit, just as the popularity of St. Nicholas himself, proved by the number of churches dedicated to him, shows the childish appetite for marvel. The temper of mind which the Oxford Movement in the last century laboured to correct and deepen, while it had not the excuse of childishness, was as superficially at peace with itself. It had narrowed down religion to respectability,

[1] "All these chyldren shall every Chyldermasse day come to paulis church and here the Chylde Bisshoppis sermon and after be at the hye masse, and eche of them to offer a j^{d} to the childe bisshopp." The boy-bishop was abolished by Henry VIII., restored by Queen Mary, and finally abolished by Elizabeth.

qualified by a formal assent to the doctrine of the Atonement and a regular hearing of sermons upon it; so that religion had become, in a different sense, a matter of the parson's conjuring, and the lay people could afford to have easy minds. It will be understood, then, why one recognizable note of Anglicanism, whether of the seventeenth or the nineteenth century, is its seriousness. It is the note of times when it has been seen that religion lays its claim upon the whole life, and is not a matter that can satisfactorily be deputed to a factor, whether priest or preacher.

This note of gravity, however, was common to all parties alike in the religious movement of the Reformation. The peculiar distinction of Anglicanism lay in three points. The first was that the English Church deepened its seriousness into devotion. The natural outcome of years of religious controversy is the decay of reverence and godly fear. When the deepest mysteries of religion are debated at every street corner, however serious the intention, the result must be that the object of such ceaseless speculation ceases to be an object of worship. From our recent experience in England of the disastrous effect that a polemical handling of sacred subjects has upon the spirit of religion, we are able to sympathize more keenly with the endeavour of Bishop Andrewes and those who followed him to emphasize worship as being the first duty of a Churchman, and

to ensure that the public services of the Church should be orderly and befitting.

In the second place, the seriousness of Anglicanism took the form of a patient investigation into the creed and ritual of the primitive Church. All that common sense and the light of nature could do in exposing the corruptions and abuses of the Roman system had already been done. It was not possible, without going back to antiquity, to distinguish what in the Roman creed was Catholic from what was merely mediæval or modern. Accordingly, while the Puritan was content to oppose the *ipse dixit* of Calvin to the definitions of the Council of Trent, English Churchmen set to work to study the Fathers. The effect of this new learning may be seen by the most cursory glance at any catena of Anglican authorities on points of doctrine. Much of their effort is devoted to showing that the passages quoted from time immemorial in favour of Roman doctrines had, in their original context, no such bearing. In this way the appeal to antiquity, as against the dogmas of both Rome and Geneva, became part of the recognized apologetic of the Church of England. This care for primitive authority co-operated with the care for worship in reinspiring in the minds of Churchmen the spirit of reverence. The state of mind in religious matters of the ordinary Englishman of the upper class at the beginning of the seventeenth century was apt to be one of aggressive independence, as of a man who

had freed his neck from an intolerable yoke, and was in no mood to bend it beneath any other. It was the part of the English Church to teach him, first, that there is a service which is perfect freedom, and then that there is no slavery in loyal submission to a Church which makes its rule of faith only what has been received from primitive times, and can be defended out of Scripture.

A third distinction of Anglicanism lay in the fact that it did not, in its new devotional spirit, lose the reasonable and practical mind which is a characteristic endowment of Englishmen. This was shown in several ways. For example, it refused to become bigoted and partisan. It endeavoured, as long as possible, to find terms of communion with Rome and with the Presbyterians. Again, in its definitions, it preserved a sense of proportion, making an effort to "rightly divide the word of truth"; distinguishing what was of faith, and so of absolute consequence, such as an article of the Apostles' Creed, from what was only secondary, such as a particular theory of the Eucharist; whereas both Rome and Geneva were as sensitive at the extreme verge of their spider's web as they were at the centre, and as zealous in anathematizing.[1] In general, we may say that

[1] Mr. Ottley, in his excellent sketch of Bishop Andrewes (*Leaders of Religion* series), has some very good remarks on this point (pp. 194–196). Mr. Hutton, in his no less excellent sketch of Archbishop Laud (in the same series), quotes some passages from Laud, indicating his breadth and tolerance (pp. 151, 152). See also a passage from Donne, quoted below, p. 59.

Anglicanism kept its eyes upon the real facts of life. The stamp of the broad English temper lies upon the first document that belongs to the English as a national Church after its separation from Rome—that Litany, unequalled in any other communion, which we owe to the liturgical genius and wide human sympathies of Archbishop Cranmer. Anxious as Cranmer always showed himself to ask counsel of foreign reformers, he was yet every bit as anxious to use the treasures of past ages ; and he found his way among ancient types and modern suggestions with a fine skill and courage and instinct for reality which has made his Litany and the Prayer-book in which it was presently included a book dear to the hearts of educated Englishmen. But the Roman reaction under Mary, with its pitiful Smithfield fires, which lost none of their lurid horror in the dramatic pages of Foxe, inevitably drove a large body of the simpler sort into the arms of those Reformers, inspired from the Continent, who advocated a total surrender of every form, or rite, or ceremony that had ever had upon it the mark of anti-Christian Rome ; and the appeal for greater simplicity was rendered a hundred-fold stronger by the new popular reading of the Bible, especially in the Genevan version with comments in the sense of Calvin. The question arose in every market-place, Where in the New Testament is there any mention of the cross in baptism, or of kneeling at the Lord's Supper ? Where is there any

mention of prelatical bishops? Where of copes, or of surplices? The question of dress was canvassed with special zeal. Why should our ministers don this "idolatrous gear"? And the more the Queen, in her headstrong Tudor way, pressed for uniformity on the lines of the Prayer-book, the more did the obstinate English spirit of the middle-class traders labour, by open defiance and secret conspiracy, to bring in the new Presbyterian discipline; being abetted in their opposition by the great Lords, who saw in the subversion of the English Church an opportunity for plunder that would have eclipsed even the golden age of the dissolution of the monasteries. The new constitution seemed so simple and claimed to be so scriptural, and the view of it, seen in the distance at Geneva, shone with such New Jerusalem glories, that there is little wonder it should have enchanted the imagination of the uneducated, especially as the zeal of its preachers contrasted only too manifestly with the apathy and ignorance of so many of the clergy, ordained in somewhat wholesale fashion to fill up the gaps made by the wholesale ejections that followed the death of Mary. "Now I pray thee," says a character in Spenser's *Shepheards Calender*—

> "Now I pray thee let me thy tale borrow
> For our Sir John to say to-morrow
> At the kirk when it is holiday;
> For well he means, but little can say."

But the English Church was saved to do its peculiar work by the characteristic caution of its best spirits, who were content to repair or even reconstruct the city that already existed, and refused to pull it down in exchange for one yet to build. Those combats in the pulpit of the Temple Church between the Master and the Reader, of which Walton tells us, really represent the typical English mind, with its innate conservatism and respect for tradition, in conflict with the heady enthusiasm of the travelled young man who has fallen in love with continental novelties. While, however, foreign fashions in dress might be ridiculed, foreign fashions in religion which posed as the absolute truth were not to be so lightly dismissed. The Temple strife long hung doubtful, and the Master, it is said, was overmatched in pulpit skill by the Reader. But if Hooker could not preach to effect, he could write as none in England before him, and few since; and retiring into the country he produced his book of *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*—a work that, if Cranmer's Litany must rank as the first literary monument of Anglicanism, is as certainly the second, and only second to it in influence; for while the former breathes, and by breathing diffuses, the spirit of reasonable and earnest devotion that we claim as our Church's peculiar heritage, the other, for the first time, put into words, and perhaps it would be true to say into thought, the very principles upon which the English Church rests. That the

English Church had any genuine vitality of its own seemed to the Presbyterian theorists hardly credible. They looked upon it as a dying stock that had been lopped of its main branches in preparation for the final work of the axe at its root; and therefore the attempt to prove that what had been cut away was really parasitical, and that what remained held within itself a vital principle, which could throw out branches and bear fruit, needed no small courage and no little insight. But this is what Hooker attempted and carried through, and the history of the Church of England as we have known it since is the best testimony to the truth of his reasoning.

The delicate position of the English Church as to controversy lay and lies in this, that against Rome it pleads the authority of the Scriptures, and against Puritanism the authority of tradition. Hence logicians on both sides have been inclined to make merry at what has come to be called the English *Via Media*. Only, just as Aristotle insists that, while Virtue may be truly defined as a mean between extremes, it is, nevertheless, in respect of goodness an extreme;[1] so we must hold that the English Church is not compromised by deflections to the right and left. Hooker and the defenders of our Church who have followed him have refused to allow that a Church which appeals to a double principle is necessarily inferior to those which rest more simply upon a single one,

[1] ἀκρότης, *Nic. Eth.*, ii. 6, 7.

since simplicity is not an attribute of Nature. In order to show that simplicity is not of the essence of Revelation either,[1] Hooker analyzes the notion of divine law, and his general conclusion, as against the Puritan idolization of Scripture, may be summed up in the following memorable sentence: "Wisdom hath diversely imparted her treasures unto the world. As her ways are of sundry kinds, so her manner of teaching is not merely one and the same. Some things she openeth by the sacred books of Scripture; some things by the glorious works of Nature; with some things she inspireth them from above by spiritual influence; in some things she leadeth and traineth them only by worldly experience and practice. We may not so in any one special kind admire her that we disgrace her in any other; but let all her ways be according unto their place and degree adored" (*Eccl. Pol.*, II. i. 4).

It may be said generally that Hooker's great achievement was to vindicate the English Church against the Puritan position on the ground of its

[1] "If we are to fix on any fundamental position as the key of [Hooker's] method of arguing, I should look for it in his doctrine, so pertinaciously urged and always implied, of the *concurrence and co-operation*, each in its due place, of all possible means of knowledge for man's direction. Take which you please, reason or Scripture, your own reason or that of others, private judgment or general consent, nature or grace, one *presupposes*—it is a favourite word with him—the existence of others, and is not intended to do its work of illumination and guidance without them: and the man who elects to go by one alone will assuredly find in the end that he has gone wrong."—Church's *Hooker*, book I. p. xvii.

reasonableness, its philosophical truth, and the correspondence of its principles with the broad facts of human life. Here was a Church that was content not to deny nature because it believed in grace, not to refuse tradition because it accepted the Scriptures, not to disobey human law because it acknowledged the existence of divine law. This reasonableness and breadth and veracity are exemplified in Hooker's own style. It is entirely free from those gross personalities common at the period, which disfigure, for instance, the Marprelate writings. What Walton says of Hooker's sermons is equally true of his treatise; its design was "to show reasons for what he spake, and with these reasons such a kind of rhetoric as did rather convince and persuade than frighten men." In the preface to the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, speaking of Cartwright's *Defence of the Admonitions*, Hooker says, "There will come a time when three words uttered with charity and meekness shall receive a far more blessed reward than three thousand volumes written with disdainful sharpness of wit." That he practised what he preached we may see not only in his contribution to the general controversy, the moderation of which we are apt to underrate because we cannot now regard his victory as anything but a foregone conclusion, but even more clearly in that particular part of it which most nearly touched his own person. Many people who know the story of the bickerings at the Temple, and

how, in Fuller's words, "the pulpit spake pure Canterbury in the morning and Geneva in the afternoon," may not have read the detailed history of the conflict as it is set out in Travers's *Supplication to the Council* against his inhibition by the Archbishop, and Hooker's answer to the charges it contained against himself. They are worthy of perusal by any one who would see in miniature a picture of the tempers of the two contending Churches; for there is far more in the difference than one between two individuals. Hooker set before him, here as elsewhere, that ideal of moderation and meekness which he and the leading Churchmen of his day held to be "primitive";[1] Travers is full of that aggressive self-sufficiency of spiritual office which marked all the leaders of his party. A short extract from each pamphlet will enable the reader to form a judgment both as to the matter controverted and the methods of the two advocates. After stating his resolution, on Hooker's being appointed Master, "constantly to seek for peace with him," Travers proceeds—"Which my resolution I so pursued that whereas I discovered sundry unsound matters in his doctrine (as many of his sermons tasted of some sour leaven or other), yet thus I carried myself towards him.

[1] Cf. Sir Henry Wotton's character of Whitgift: "He was a man of reverend and sacred memory, and of the *primitive* temper; such a temper as when the Church by *lowliness of spirit* did flourish in highest examples of virtue."

Matters of smaller weight, and so covertly delivered that no great offence to the Church was to be feared in them, I wholly passed by; for others of great moment and so openly delivered as there was just cause of fear lest the truth and Church of God should be prejudiced and perilled by it, and such as the conscience of my duty and calling would not suffer me altogether to pass over, this was my course; to deliver, when I should have just cause by my text, *the truth* of such doctrine as he had otherwise taught, in general speeches, without touch of his person in any sort, and further at convenient opportunity to confer with him on such points. According to which determination, whereas he had taught certain things concerning predestination *otherwise than the Word of God doth, as it is understood by all churches professing the gospel.* . . . I both delivered *the truth* of such points in a general doctrine without any touch of him in particular, and conferred with him also privately upon such articles. In which conference, I remember, when I urged the consent of all churches and good writers against him, that I knew; and desired, if it were otherwise, to understand what authors he had seen of such doctrine: he answered me, that his best author was his own reason."

To which charge Hooker replies first, that as Travers held it unlawful in the pulpit to cite any particular authority, lest it should seem to cast a

doubt on the sufficiency of Scripture, but only allowed himself to say, on the one hand, "the Painims think this, or the heathen that," and on the other to quote "all churches" and "all good writers," he had not thought it worth while "to control this over-reaching speech by sentences out of Church confessions, together with the best-learned monuments of further times, and not the meanest of our own: for what had this booted me? . . . I alleged therefore that which might under no pretence be disallowed, namely reason; not meaning thereby mine own reason as now it is reported, but true, sound, divine reason; reason whereby those conclusions might be out of St. Paul demonstrated and not probably discoursed of only; reason proper to that science whereby the things of God are known; theological reason, which, out of principles in Scripture that are plain, soundly deduceth more doubtful inferences, in such sort that being heard they neither can be denied, nor anything repugnant unto them received, but whatsoever was before otherwise by miscollecting gathered out of darker places is thereby forced to yield itself, and the true consonant meaning of sentences not understood is brought to light."

To appreciate the passages given above, it must be remembered that Travers was reputed one of the greatest preachers and most learned men of his day on the Puritan side, and that most of the

Benchers, and even Lord Burleigh, had wished to make him Master instead of Hooker. If he and his party had triumphed, it is evident that the *Institutio* and Commentaries of John Calvin would have held a place in the English Church higher even than that from which the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas had been deposed; there would have been no appeal from them; for it is perfectly clear that by "all churches" and "all good writers" Mr. Travers had meant the churches in union with Geneva, and the preachers who followed Calvin. One other passage may be quoted from this instructive controversy for the light it throws upon the attitude of the two parties to the Church of Rome.

"When as [Hooker] had taught 'That the Church of Rome is a true Church of Christ, and a sanctified Church by profession of that truth which God hath revealed unto us by His Son, though not a pure and perfect Church'; and further 'That he doubted not but that thousands of the Fathers which lived and died in the superstitions of that Church were saved because of their ignorance which excused them'; misalleging to that end a text of Scripture to prove it (1 Tim. i. 13): the matter being of set purpose openly and at large handled by him, and of that moment that might prejudice the faith of Christ, encourage the ill-affected to continue still in their damnable ways, and others weak in faith to suffer themselves easily to be seduced to the destruction of

their souls; I thought it my most bounden duty to God and to His Church, whilst I might have opportunity to speak with him, to teach *the truth* in a general speech in such points of doctrine. At which time I taught, 'That such as die, or have died at any time in the Church of Rome, holding in their ignorance that faith which is taught in it, and namely justification in part by works, could not be said by the Scriptures to be saved. . . .' Mr. Hooker, the next Sabbath, leaving to proceed upon his ordinary text, professed to preach again that he had done the day before, for some question that his doctrine was drawn into, which he desired might be examined with all severity. So proceeding, he bestowed his whole time in that discourse, confirming his former doctrine, and answering the places of Scripture which I had alleged to prove that a man dying in the Church of Rome is not to be judged by the Scriptures to be saved. In which long speech, and utterly impertinent to his text, under colour of answering for himself, he impugned directly and openly to all men's understanding the *true* doctrine which I had delivered; and adding to his former points some other like (as willingly one error follows another) that is, 'That the Galatians, joining with faith in Christ circumcision as necessary to salvation, might be saved; and that they of the Church of Rome may be saved by such a faith of Christ as they have, with a general repentance of all their errors, notwithstanding their opinion of

justification in part by their works and merits'; I was necessarily, though not willingly, drawn to say something to the points he objected against sound doctrine . . . which my answer, as it was most necessary for the service of God and the Church, so was it without any immodest or reproachful speech to Mr. Hooker: whose unsound and wilful dealings in a cause of so great importance to the faith of Christ and salvation of the Church, notwithstanding I knew well what speech it deserved, and what some zealous, earnest men of the spirit of John and James, surnamed Boanerges, Sons of Thunder, would have said in such case, yet I chose rather to content myself in exhorting him to revisit his doctrine, as Nathan the prophet did the device, which, without consulting with God, he had of himself given to David concerning the building of the Temple; and with Peter the Apostle to endure to be withstood in such a case, not unlike unto this?"

It would be tedious to give Hooker's answer in detail;[1] but it may be interesting to give here a short

[1] It is a happiness to be able to point out that all the great Anglicans demurred in strong terms to the damnation so lavishly distributed by both Romanists and Puritans; thus Laud, speaking of the Calvinist doctrine of Reprobation, says: "Which opinion my very soul abominates; for it makes God, the God of all mercies, to be the most fierce and unreasonable tyrant in the world." And so Chillingworth, against the Roman position that disagreeing Protestants must be damned since some of them must needs deny revealed truth, says: "Let all such errors be as damnable as you please to make 'em, in the meanwhile if they suffer themselves neither to be betrayed into their

passage from the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, in which he expresses in a lucid sentence what should be the attitude of any true Church, and is the attitude of the Church of England, towards the Church of Rome: "To say that in nothing they may be followed which are of the Church of Rome were violent and extreme. Some things they do in that they are men; in that they are wise men and Christian men some things; some things in that they are men misled and blinded with error. As far as they follow wisdom and truth we fear not to tread the self-same steps wherein they have gone, and to be their followers. Where Rome keepeth that which is ancienter and better, others whom we much more affect, leaving it for newer and changing it for worse; we had rather follow the perfections of them whom we like not, than in defects resemble them whom we love" (v. xxviij. 1).

From what has been quoted the reader will probably agree that, if Hooker may be taken as representing the special genius of the English Church, we may claim for that Church a breadth of view, a devotion to truth wherever found, and a faith in right reason which sharply distinguish her from Puritanism on the one side and Romanism on the other. One of the

errors, nor kept in them, by any sin of their will; if they do their best endeavour to free themselves from all errors, and yet fail of it through human frailty; so well am I persuaded of the goodness of God that if in me alone should meet a confluence of all such errors of all the Protestants in the world that were thus qualified, *I should not be so much afraid of them all as I should be to ask pardon for them.*"

beautiful vignettes which Walton gives us in his life of Hooker is the picture of that pastor tending his few sheep in the common field while he reads the Odes of Horace. Between the temper of mind which speaks of "all the Painim writers," and that larger humanity which can appreciate, as Newman says, "the sad earnestness and vivid exactness of lines, the birth of some chance morning or evening among the Sabine Hills," the English nation has chosen, and, as most of us think, chosen wisely. The larger humanity that we find in Hooker we find no less in the other great leaders of the Church at this period. Among the friends of Bishop Andrewes was numbered Francis Bacon, who submitted to his judgment *The Advancement of Learning*, and dedicated to him the unwritten *Holy War;* a specially intimate friend was the great scholar Isaac Casaubon, who found in the English Church a love of learning and reverence for antiquity for which he had looked in vain among Calvinists and Huguenots. I will not attempt any examination of Andrewes' Sermons, because they are to-day little read, and perhaps can hardly be reckoned as living literature;[1] but I will call attention to some qualities

[1] There is an eloquent eulogy of them in a paper by Dean Church (*Masters in English Theology*, p. 95), from which a short passage may be extracted, especially as it calls attention to one feature of them which is typically Anglican. After speaking of the preaching of the previous generation, he says: "In Andrewes you feel as if he had broken bounds. You see at once a wider horizon, objects of faith and contemplation at once more real, more personal, more august; you become aware of your relation to a vaster and more diversified world, a world full of

of his *Devotions*, which still, perhaps more than ever, live in the hands and on the lips of English worshippers. I would notice, first of all, that characteristic which is so prominent in Hooker—the recognition of the work of reason in the world as an ordinance of God—

"O King of nations, unto the ends of the earth;
strengthen all the states
of the inhabited world,
as being Thy ordinance,
though a creation of man," etc.
(*First Day—Intercession.*)

In the second place, one remarks the breadth of their sympathy in intercession, and of their acknowledgment in praise, and how both praises and intercessions mirror life sanely and truly. For an

mystery, yet touching you on every side. Doctrine you have, dogmatic teaching as precise and emphatic as anywhere; but it is doctrine as wide as the Scripture in its comprehensiveness and variety, reflecting at every turn the unutterable and overwhelming wonders which rise before us when we think of what we mean by the creeds, corresponding in its dignity, in its versatile application, to the real history of man, to the deep and manifold wants of the soul, its aspirations, its terrible sins, its cruel fears, its capacities for hope and delight, the strange fortunes of the race, and of the story of each individual life. His theology was instinct with the awful consciousness of our immense and hopeless ignorance of the ways and counsels of God—*with that shrinking from speculation on the secret things of the most High which he shared with Hooker, and which, as a professed law of divinity, was something new in the theological world of the day.* "For these sixteen years since I was ordained priest," he says in his judgment on the Lambeth Articles, "I have never, publicly or privately, disputed or preached on these mysteries of predestination."

example, consider the Intercession for the Second Day, which, to save space, I will write down, except for one specially important passage, in continuous prose (following Newman's version): "Let us pray God for the whole creation; for the supply of seasons, healthy, fruitful, peaceful; for the whole race of mankind; for those who are not Christians; for the conversion of Atheists, the ungodly; Gentiles, Turks, and Jews; for all Christians; for restoration of all who languish in faults and sins; for confirmation of all who have been granted truth and grace; for succour and comfort of all who are dispirited, infirm, distressed, unsettled, men and women; for thankfulness and sobriety in all who are hearty, healthy, prosperous, quiet, men and women:

for the Catholic Church, its establishment and increase;
for the Eastern, its deliverance and union;
for the Western, its adjustment and peace;
for the British, the supply of what is wanting in it, the strengthening of what remains in it;

for the episcopate, presbytery, Christian people; for the states of the inhabited world; for Christian states, far off, near at hand; for our own; for all in rule; for our divinely-guarded King; the queen and the prince; for those who have place in the court; for parliament and judicature, army and police, commons and their leaders, farmers, graziers, fishers,

merchants, traders, and mechanics, down to mean workmen, and the poor; for the rising generation; for the good nurture of all the royal family, of the young ones of the nobility; for all in universities, in law colleges, in schools in town or country, in apprenticeships; for those who have a claim on me from relationship, for brothers and sisters, that God's blessing may be on them, and on their children; OR from benefit conferred, that Thy recompense may be on all who have benefitted me, who have ministered to me in carnal things; OR from trust placed in me, for all whom I have educated, all whom I have ordained; for my college, my parish, Southwell, St. Paul's, Westminster, Dioceses of Chichester, Ely, and my present [Winchester] clergy, people, helps, governments, the deanery in the chapel royal, the almonry, the colleges committed to me [as Visitor]; OR from natural kindness, for all who love me, though I know them not; OR from Christian love; for those who hate me without cause, some too even on account of truth and righteousness; OR from neighbourhood, for all who dwell near me peaceably and harmlessly; OR from promise, for all whom I have promised to remember in my prayers; OR from mutual offices, for all who remember me in their prayers, and ask of me the same; OR from stress of engagements, for all who on sufficient reasons fail to call upon Thee; for all who have no intercessor in their own behalf; for all who at present are in agony of extreme

necessity or deep affliction ; for all who are attempting any good work which will bring glory to the Name of God or some great good to the Church ; for all who act nobly either towards things sacred or towards the poor ; for all who have ever been offended by me either in word or in deed."

Side by side with this may be placed one of the Acts of Thanksgiving, that for the Fifth Day : " O Lord, my Lord, for my being, life, reason ; for nurture, protection, guidance ; for education, civil rights, religion ; for Thy gifts of grace, nature, fortune ; for redemption, regeneration, catechizing ; for my call, recall, yea many calls besides ; for Thy forbearance, long-suffering, long long-suffering to me-ward ; many seasons, many years, up to this time ; for all good things received, successes granted me, good things done ; for the use of things present, for Thy promise, and my hope of the enjoyment of good things to come ; for my parents honest and good, teachers kind, benefactors never to be forgotten, religious intimates congenial, hearers thoughtful, friends sincere, domestics faithful ; for all who have advantaged me by writings, homilies, converse, prayers, patterns, rebukes, injuries ; for all these, and all others which I know, which I know not ; open, hidden ; remembered, forgotten ; done when I wished, when I wished not ; I confess to Thee, and will confess ; I bless Thee, and will bless ; I give thanks to Thee, and will give thanks, all the days of my life."

We cannot fail to notice that these world-wide praises and intercessions became possible on no narrower basis than the Church's Creed. Such a thanksgiving, for instance, as that just quoted could not have been written by any one who held the doctrine of the "Lambeth Articles" upon predestination. Finally, the *Devotions* bring clearly into view the type of character which Andrewes sets before himself as an ideal. From the Prayer for Grace on the Fourth Day let me extract two petitions which seem typically English in their common sense and honesty, and also in their combination of saintly qualities of mind with the practical recognition that poverty is not in northern climes a bride to be wooed—

"Give me
humility, pitifulness, patience,
sobriety, purity, contentment, ready zeal.

* * * * *

Grant me a happy life
in piety, gravity, purity,
in all things good and fair,
in cheerfulness, in health, in credit,
in competency, in safety, in gentle estate, in quiet;
a happy death,
a deathless happiness."

Next in order, after Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* and Andrewes' *Devotions*, among the evidences which

exhibit and the influences which helped to shape the peculiar temper of the English Church, must be placed the writings we associate with the great names of John Donne and George Herbert. They were both men in the foremost intellectual rank of their day—scholars and gentlemen, even courtiers; both fought long and hard against the divine decrees which were urging them to the ministry; but both, when their decision was once made, threw themselves heart and soul into their new profession, and by their zeal and genius created, we may almost say, a new type—the one of a town preacher, the other of a country parson. Their influence upon their own age was exercised in Donne's case by his sermons; in Herbert's through his poems; and both these influences still operate. But it is probable that the impression their character has exerted upon later generations is quite as much due to the portraits of them which have been handed down by the religious genius of Izaak Walton, who may himself be said to have first exhibited in English literature the type of the Anglican layman as we know him to-day—devout, reasonable, modest. Readers of Walton's delightful biographies will recall his fondness for the appeal to antiquity, "those first and most blessed times of Christianity;" they will remember that he justifies Donne and Herbert for writing sacred poems by the example of Prudentius, and the use of Church music from St. Augustine's love of it; that his

highest epithet of praise is "primitive," and that it is commonly found with the words "humility" or "charity." Another trait that he is never tired of emphasizing in the characters of the worthies he had known and loved is their averseness from controversy. In his sketch of the life of Sir Henry Wotton, the distinguished ambassador of James to Venice, afterwards Provost of Eton, a Churchman and angler after Walton's own heart, he collects various anecdotes, some of which may find a place here, as they throw a light on the way in which the current controversies were viewed by those who had a zeal for the true welfare of the Church.

"He was a great enemy to wrangling disputes of Religion, concerning which I shall say a little, both to testify that and to show the readiness of his wit. Having at his being in Rome made acquaintance with a pleasant Priest, who invited him one evening to hear their Vesper music at church, the Priest, seeing Sir Henry stand obscurely in a corner, sends to him by a boy of the choir this question writ in a small piece of paper: 'Where was your religion *to be found before Luther?*'[1] To which question Sir Henry presently underwrit: 'My religion was to be found *then* where yours is not to be found *now*, in

[1] Donne's answer to this stock question may be quoted: "They that ask now *Where was your Church before Luther?* would then have asked of the Jews, *Where was your Church before Esdras?* That was in Babylon, ours was in Rome."—Second sermon on Ezek. xxxiv. 19.

the written Word of God.' The next Vesper Sir Henry went purposely to the same church, and sent one of the choir boys with this question to his honest, pleasant friend, the priest: 'Do you believe all those many thousands of poor Christians were damned, that were excommunicated because the Pope and the Duke of Venice could not agree about their temporal power, even those poor Christians that knew not why they quarrelled? Speak your conscience.' To which he underwrit in French: 'Monsieur, excusez-moi.' To one that asked him 'Whether a Papist may be saved?' he replied, 'You may be saved without knowing that. Look to yourself.' To another, whose earnestness exceeded his knowledge and was still railing against the Papists, he gave this advice: 'Pray, sir, forbear till you have studied the points better; for the wise Italians have this proverb: "He that understands amiss concludes worse." And take heed of thinking the farther you go from the Church of Rome, the nearer you are to God.'"

The last two stories, and others of the like sort to be found in Walton, explain the feeling which made Wotton, in Walton's phrase, "choose for the epitaph on his tombstone only this prudent, pious sentence to discover his disposition and preserve his memory—

> 'Hic jacet hujus sententiæ primus Author:
> Disputandi pruritus, ecclesiarum scabies;'

which may be Englished thus: 'Here lies the first

author of this sentence: The itch of disputation will prove the scab of the Church.'"

Donne was eminently fitted to be an advocate of the *via media*, seeing that he had won his way to it from the Roman faith, to which his mother's family had supplied martyrs and confessors. While still a layman Donne had made himself very learned in the controversy between the Churches, helping Morton, afterwards Bishop of Durham, in his polemical works, and himself contributing a book, the *Pseudomartyr*, on the question of the Oath of Allegiance; and in his sermons he steers his way between the two parties with a fine religious tact, being equally on the alert to press home points in which he considered the Roman Church to have gone astray, and to expose the pretensions of Calvinistic omniscience; but refusing to be deterred by any shibboleths from welcoming truth wherever he recognized it. He says in one place: "Beloved, there are some things in which all religions agree: the worship of God, the holiness of life. Therefore, if when I study this holiness of life, and fast, and pray, and submit myself to discreet and medicinal mortifications for the subduing of my body, any man will say, 'This is papistical! Papists do this!' it is a blessed protestation, and no man is the less a Protestant or the worse a Protestant for making it: 'I am a Papist! that is, I will fast and pray as much as any Papist, and enable myself for the service of my God, as

seriously, as sedulously, as laboriously as any Papist.' So if, when I startle and am affected at a blasphemous oath as at a wound upon my Saviour, when I avoid the conversation of those men that profane the Lord's Day, any other will say, 'This is puritanical! Puritans do this!' it is a blessed protestation, and no man is the less a Protestant nor the worse a Protestant for making it: 'Men and brethren, I am a Puritan! that is, I will endeavour to be pure as my Father in heaven is pure, as far as any Puritan'" (i. 493).

We notice in Donne how, like Hooker and Andrewes, he resented the fierce controversial style of the day. In one of his letters, speaking of a book written on the Anglican side against Rome, he says it is written "for religion, without it;" and in a sermon preached before the Court (ii. 254) he takes occasion, in pointing out how loth St. Augustine was to accuse Tertullian of heresy, to deprecate the abuse of that term to every difference between the churches. "I would Saint Augustine's charity might prevail with them that pretend to be *Augustinianissimi*, and to admire him so much in the Roman Church, not to cast the name of heresy upon every problem, nor the name of heretic upon every inquirer of truth. St. Augustine would deliver Tertullian from heresy in a point concerning God, and they will condemn us of heresy in every point that may be drawn to concern, not the Church, but the Court of Rome; not their doctrine, but their profit. I shall better answer

God for my mildness than for my severity. And though anger against a brother, or a *Raca*, or a *Fool* will bear an action, yet he shall recover less against me at that bar whom I have called weak or misled (as I must necessarily call many in the Roman Church) than he whom I have passionately and peremptorily called heretic. For I dare call an opinion heresy for the matter a great while before I dare call the man that holds it an heretic. For that consists much in the manner. It must be matter of faith before the matter be heresy; but there must be pertinacy after convenient instruction before that man be an heretic."

As Donne's sermons are now little known, I may be excused for quoting a few passages to exhibit the importance which he, like the other Anglican leaders, attached to reverence in all offices of devotion. First, as to the reasonableness of ritual: "Quench not the light of nature, suffer not *that* light to go out; study your natural faculties, husband and improve them; and love the outward acts of religion, though an hypocrite and though a natural man may do them. He that cares not though the material church fall, I am afraid, is falling from the spiritual. For can a man be sure to have his money or his plate if his house be burnt, or to preserve his faith if the outward exercises of religion fail? He that undervalues outward things in the religious service of God, though he begin at ceremonial and ritual things, will come

quickly to call Sacraments but outward things, and Sermons and Public Prayers but outward things in contempt. As some Platonic philosophers did so over-refine religion and devotion as to say that nothing but the *first* thoughts and ebullitions of a devout heart were fit to serve God in; if it came to any outward action of the body, kneeling, or lifting up of heads, if it came to be but invested in our words, and so made a prayer, nay, if it passed but a revolving, a turning in our inward thoughts, and thereby were mingled with our affections, though pious affections, yet, say they, it is not pure enough for a service to God; nothing but the first motions of the heart is for Him. Beloved, outward things apparel God; and since God was content to take a body, let us not leave Him naked nor ragged" (ii. 330).

In regard to keeping set times of devotion, Donne has a few careful sentences in a sermon on the text, "For this shall every one that is godly make his prayer unto Thee in a time when Thou mayest be found": "This *time* is not those *Horæ stativæ*, *Horæ Canonicæ*, those fixed hours in the Roman Church where men are bound to certain prayers at certain hours. Not that it is inconvenient for men to bind themselves to certain fixed times of prayer in their private exercises; and though not by such a vow as that it shall be an impiety, yet by so solemn a purpose as that it shall be a levity, to break it" (i. 569).

But he has no toleration for the practice of treating

prayers as so much matter to be got through; for such a notion conflicts with the very idea of prayer as devotion, which even when we do our best is sure to be imperfect: "We have not leisure to speak of the abuse of prayer in the Roman Church; where they will antedate and postdate their prayers; say to-morrow's prayers to-day, and to-day's prayers to-morrow, if they have other uses and employments of the due times between; where they will trade and make merchandise of prayers by way of exchange; my man shall fast for me, and I will pray for my man; or my attorney and proxy shall pray for us both at my charge; nay, where they will play for prayers, and the loser must pray for both; to this there belongs but a holy scorn, and I would fain pass it over quickly. But when we consider with a religious seriousness the manifold weaknesses of the strongest devotions in time of prayer, it is a sad consideration. I throw myself down in my chamber, and I call in and invite God and His angels thither, and when they are there, I neglect God and His angels for the noise of a fly, for the rattling of a coach, for the whining of a door. I talk on in the same posture of praying, eyes lifted up, knees bowed down, as though I prayed to God; and if God or His angels should ask me when I thought last of God in that prayer, I cannot tell; sometimes I find that I had forgot what I was about, but when I began to forget it I cannot tell. A memory of yesterday's pleasures,

a fear of to-morrow's dangers, a straw under my knee, a noise in mine ear, a light in mine eye, an anything, a nothing, a fancy, a chimæra in my brain, troubles me in my prayer. So certainly is there nothing, nothing in spiritual things, perfect in this world" (i. 820).

A very interesting passage upon ceremonies in general, arising out of a discussion on the question of lights, comes in a sermon on the Purification: "It is in this ceremony of lights as it is in other ceremonies; they may be good in their institution and grow ill in their practice. So did many things, which the Christian Church received from the Gentiles in a harmless innocency, degenerate after into as pestilent superstition there as amongst the Gentiles themselves. For ceremonies, which were received but for the instruction and edification of the weaker sort of people, were made real parts of the service of God and meritorious sacrifices. To those ceremonies which were received as *signa commonefacientia*, helps to excite and awaken devotion, was attributed an operative and an effectual power, even to the ceremony itself; and they were not practised as they should be, *significative* but *effective*, not as things which should signify to the people higher mysteries, but as things as powerful and effectual in themselves as the greatest mysteries of all, the Sacraments themselves. So lights were received in the Primitive Church to signify to the people that God, the Father of lights,

was otherwise present in that place than in any other, and then men came to offer lights by way of sacrifice to God. And so that which was providently intended for man, who, indeed, needed such helps, was turned upon God as though He were to be supplied by us. But what then? Because things good in their intention may be depraved in their practice—'Ergone nihil ceremoniarum rudioribus dabitur ad juvandam eorum imperitiam?' Shall therefore the people be denied all ceremonies for the assistance of their weakness? 'Id ego non dico'; I say not so, says he.[1] 'Omnino illis utile esse sentio hoc genus adminiculi'; I think these kinds of helps to be very behooveful for them—'Tantum hoc contendo'; all that I strive for is but moderation; and that moderation he places very discreetly in this, that these ceremonies may be few in number, that they may be easy for observation; that they may be clearly understood in their signification. We must not therefore be hasty in condemning particular ceremonies, for in so doing in this ceremony of lights we may condemn the Primitive Church that did use them, and we condemn a great and noble part of the Reformed Church which doth use them at this day" (i. 80).

Donne not unfrequently in his sermons takes

[1] The authority here adduced by Donne is that of Calvin, whose reputation at this time in England stood very high, and whom Donne always refers to with respect, and quotes very happily against those who counted themselves his followers.

occasion to defend the English Church for its assiduity in preaching, but at the same time he is careful to warn the clergy against mere appeals to the emotions which do not touch the reason and conscience: "If they [the Roman Catholics] deride us for often preaching, and call us fools for that; as David said, 'He would be more vile,' he would dance more, so let us be more fools in the foolishness of preaching, and preach more. If they think us mad, since we are mad for your souls (as the apostle speaks) let us be more mad. Let him that hath preached once do it twice, and him that hath preached twice do it thrice; but yet not thus, by coming to a negligent and extemporal manner of preaching" (i. 325).

He points out that though extemporal sermons may have been justified in primitive times on account of the greater ignorance of the people, the advance in education in his day laid a greater claim upon the preacher. On the other hand, he calls attention to the fact that those sectaries who exalt preaching out of its place into the sole means of grace soon come to treat it as a merely human ordinance, which they may attend and criticize without any feeling of reverence. He adds that unlearned preaching is the first step to heresy, and leads ultimately to schism. The sense of the following paragraph must be judged apart from its relevance to the text from which it is educed: "When the apostle says, *Study to be quiet* (1 Thess. iv. 11), methinks he intimates

something towards this, that the less we study for our sermons, the more danger is there to disquiet the auditory; extemporal, unpremeditated sermons that serve the popular ear, vent for the most part doctrines that disquiet the Church. *Study* for them and they will *be quiet;* consider ancient and fundamental doctrines, and this will quiet and settle the understanding and the conscience. Many of these extemporal men have gone away from us, and vainly said that they have as good cause to separate from us as we from Rome.[1] But can they call our Church 'a *Babylon*, confusion, disorder'? All that offends them is that we have too much order, too much

[1] The justification of the English breach with Rome is handled earlier in the same sermon in a curious passage that may be quoted as a specimen of the wit that made Donne famous in the days before his ordination, though it is rare in his sermons (ii. 214).

"They vex us now with the question, Why if your fathers, when they eat our trodden grass and drunk our troubled waters, were sound and in health and continued sheep, and God's sheep and God's flock, His Church with us, why went they from us? They owed us their residence, because they had received their baptism from us. And truly it is not an impertinent, a frivolous reason that of baptism, where there is nothing but conveniency and no necessity in the case. But if I be content to stay with my friend in an aguish air, will he take it ill if I go when the plague comes? Or if I stay in town till twenty die of the plague, shall it be looked that I should stay when there die one thousand? The infection grew hotter and hotter in Rome, and their *may* came to a *must;* those things which were done before *de facto* came at last to be articles of faith and *de jure*, must be believed and practised upon salvation. They chide us for going away, and they drove us away; if we abstained from communicating with their poisons (being now grown to that height) they excommunicated us; they gave us no room amongst them but the fire, and they were so forward to burn heretics that they called it heresy not to stay to be burnt."

regularity, too much binding to the orderly and uniform service of God in His Church" (ii. 216).

I have illustrated by these few passages the general line which Donne took in matters debated in his day, so as to show his notion of the Anglican ideal; but, for the most part, his sermons come up to the type which George Herbert lays down for all sermons, "that their main character should be not controversial but holy, the words and sentences being dipped and seasoned in the heart of the preacher before they come into the mouth."

The book from which that sentence comes—*A Priest to the Temple; or, the Country Parson, his Character and Rule of Holy Life*—is an invaluable document for letting us see what the best spirits in the second generation of Anglican divines thought of their office and its duties and the Church in which they ministered.

"A Pastor," Herbert begins, "is the deputy of Christ, to reduce [bring back] man to the obedience of God. Out of this charter of the priesthood may be plainly gathered both the dignity thereof and the duty: the dignity, in that a priest may do that which Christ did, and by his authority, and as his vice-gerent; the duty, in that a priest is to do that which Christ did, and after his manner, both for doctrine and life."

"The Country Parson," he continues, "is exceedingly exact in his life, being holy, just, prudent, temperate, bold, grave in all his ways. . . . To put

on the profound humility and the exact temperance of our Lord Jesus Christ, with other exemplary virtues of that sort, and to keep them on in the sunshine and noon of prosperity, he findeth to be as necessary, and as difficult at least, as to be clothed with perfect patience and Christian fortitude in the cold midnight storms of persecution and adversity."

In the conduct of public worship what Herbert most dwells upon is the necessity for reverence. "The Country Parson being to administer the Sacraments, is at a stand with himself how or what behaviour to assume for so holy things. Especially at Communion times he is in a great confusion, as being not only to receive God, but to break and administer Him. Neither finds he any issue in this, but to throw himself down at the throne of grace saying, 'Lord, Thou knowest what Thou didst when Thou appointedst it to be done thus; therefore do Thou fulfil what Thou didst appoint, for Thou art not only the Feast but the way to it.' For the manner of receiving, as the parson *useth all reverence himself*, so he administers to none but the *reverent*. The Feast indeed requires sitting because it is a Feast; but man's unpreparedness asks kneeling. He that comes to the Sacrament hath the confidence of a guest, and he that kneels confesseth himself an unworthy one, and therefore differs from other feasters; but he that sits or lies, puts up to an apostle. *Contentiousness in a feast of charity is more*

scandal than any posture. At Baptism, being himself in white, he requires the presence of all, and baptizeth not willingly but on Sundays or great days. He says that prayer *with great devotion* where God is thanked for calling us to the knowledge of His grace, Baptism being a blessing that the world hath not the like. He willingly and cheerfully crosseth the child, and thinketh the ceremony not only innocent but reverent. . . . The Country Parson, when he is to read divine services, composeth himself *to all possible reverence;* this he doth, first, as being truly touched and amazed with the majesty of God, before whom he then presents himself; yet not as himself alone, but as presenting with himself the whole congregation, whose sins he then bears and brings with his own to the heavenly altar to be bathed and washed in the sacred laver of Christ's blood. Secondly, as this is the true reason of his inward fear, so he is content to express this outwardly to the utmost of his power, that being first affected himself he may affect also his own people, knowing that no sermon moves them so much to a reverence, which they forget again when they come to pray, as a devout behaviour in the very act of praying. . . . The character of his sermons is *holiness;* it is gained first by choosing texts of devotion, not controversy, moving and ravishing texts, whereof the Scriptures are full."

As reverence is to be the predominant note of

the parson and people, so decency and order are to prevail in the church and its furniture. "The Country Parson hath a special care of his church, that all things there be decent and befitting His Name by which it is called. Therefore first he taketh order that all things be in good repair: as walls plastered; windows glazed; floor paved; seats whole, firm, and uniform; especially that the Pulpit and Desk, and Communion Table and Font be as they ought for those great duties that are performed in them. Secondly, that the church be swept and kept clean, without dust or cobwebs, and at great festivals strawed and stuck with boughs, and perfumed with incense. . . . And all this he doth, not as out of necessity, or as putting a holiness in the things, but as desiring to keep the *middle way* between superstition and slovenliness, and as following the apostle's two great and admirable rules on things of this nature: the first whereof is, *Let all things be done decently and in order;* the second, *Let all things be done to edification.*"

The same idea of the English ritual as a mean between those of Rome and Geneva is found in Herbert's poem of *The British Church*—

> "A fine aspect in fit array,
> Neither too mean nor yet too gay,
> Shows who is best.
> Outlandish [*i.e.* foreign] looks may not compare,
> For all they either painted are
> Or else undrest.

"She on the hills, which wantonly
Allureth all, in hope to be
By her preferr'd,
Hath kiss'd so long her painted shrines,
That e'en her face, by kissing, shines
For her reward.

"She in the valley is so shy
Of dressing, that her hair doth lie
About her ears;
While she avoids her neighbour's pride,
She wholly goes on th' other side,
And nothing wears."

But if the note of reverence is plainly struck all through *The Country Parson,* the other Anglican note of reasonableness is no less prominent. In his remarks on Preaching, Herbert is in advance of the practice of his day. "A sermon," he says, "should consist of a plain and evident declaration of the meaning of the text," followed by "some choice observations drawn out of the whole text as it lies entire and unbroken in the Scripture itself." To crumble a text into small parts "hath in it," he says, "neither sweetness nor gravity, since the words apart are not Scripture but a dictionary." In another place he adds that a text must be considered "with the coherence thereof, touching what goes before and what follows after," as also the place where it comes in the canon. The same reasonable temper justifies both the appeal to the Fathers and the use of the preacher's own judgment. "As he doth not so study others as to neglect the grace of God in himself and

what the Holy Spirit teacheth him, so doth he assure himself that God in all ages hath had His servants to whom He hath revealed His truth, as well as to him." The like spirit of sanctified common sense is displayed in his treatment of Fasting, upon which subject his remarks are worth attention at the present day, when reason in such matters seems in some quarters at a discount. The passage is too long to quote; it will be found in the chapter entitled "A parson in his house." To Private Confession he has the following short reference: "In his visiting the sick or otherwise afflicted he followeth the Church's counsel, namely, in persuading them to particular confession, labouring to make them understand the great good use of this ancient and pious ordinance, and how necessary it is in some cases."

On turning to Herbert's poems, the reader finds little, notwithstanding their title of *The Temple* or *Church*, that has upon the surface any immediate reference to the Church of England. Besides *The British Church*, quoted above, there is a lament upon *Church Rents and Schisms*, an apology for declining the invocation of Saints (*To all Saints and Angels*), a passing reflection upon the Roman doctrine of merit in *Judgment*, some lines upon *Church Music*, and a very sad forecast, which has happily been falsified, of the decay of English religion in the poem called *The Church Militant*. Besides these, and a few poems upon his own ordination, it may

seem at first sight as if there were nothing in the volume to determine it to any one Communion. But a more attentive consideration reveals the fact that a large proportion of the poems are poems of personal devotion, acts of faith, acts of praise—exercises which Puritanism was inclined to rank as idle ; and further, that the devotional poems are pitched in a key whose reserve contrasts strikingly with the fiery ardours and ecstasies characteristic of the Roman Church. Mr. Shorthouse, in an interesting preface to the facsimile reprint of *The Temple* (Unwin, 1883)—a preface which, among much that is fantastic and uncritical, contains several penetrating comments—lays it down that it was the peculiar mission of Herbert and his fellows to reveal to the uncultured and unlearned "the true refinement of worship." The phrase seems to be an eminently happy one. For just as in their ordinary social life Englishmen value taste above mere profusion and display, and reticence above self-abandonment to exuberant feelings, so in divine worship we associate reverence with the prophet's veiled lips rather than with the gush of sensibility, however eloquent. We approach the altar with "reverence and godly fear"; we should wish our feelings there to be calm, sober, contemplative. It is this temper, serious, solemnized, and humble with the dignity of a child of God, to which Herbert has given so perfect an expression. It passes through many moods—praise, expostulation, penitence, longing,

love—but they are all touched with the same grave restraint. How full of dignity is the deprecation of the poem called *Discipline!*

"Throw away Thy rod,
Throw away Thy wrath,
O my God!
Take the gentle path.

"For my heart's desire
Unto Thine is bent;
I aspire
To a full consent.

"Though I fail, I weep;
Though I halt in pace,
Yet I creep
To the Throne of grace.

"Throw away Thy rod!
Though man frailties hath,
Thou art God!
Throw away Thy wrath."

The same calm and confident faith inspires the well-known poem called *Praise*, which begins—

"King of glory, King of peace,
I will love Thee."

And there are many others in the same key. Even the poems to our Lord, where more effusion is naturally in place, are entirely lacking in that tone of familiarity which is so distressing in many devotions used by Romanists and our own dissenters. We find a rare sweetness indeed, but no want of delicacy or refinement. What could be more humble

in spirit, with all its affection, than the piece called *Dialogue*, which opens—

> "Sweetest Saviour, if my love
> Were but worth the having"?

or that exquisite verse on the Resurrection—

> "I got me flowers to strew Thy way;
> I got me boughs off many a tree:
> But Thou wast up by break of day,
> And broughtst Thy sweets along with Thee"?

The difference between the Anglican and Roman spirit in these matters may be seen by putting a verse from Herbert side by side with one from Crashaw, choosing from the latter not poems like *The Flaming Heart* or *The Assumption of the Virgin*, with the subjects of which we should be out of sympathy, but a direct address to our Lord that might be made by any Christian, such as the following "Song":—

> "Lord, when the sense of Thy sweet grace
> Sends up my soul to seek Thy face,
> Thy blessed eyes breed such desire
> I die in Love's delicious fire.
> O Love, I am Thy sacrifice;
> Be still triumphant, blessed eyes!
> Still shine on me, fair suns, that I
> Still may behold, though still I die.
>
> "Though still I die, I live again,
> Still longing so to be still slain;
> So gainful is such loss of breath,
> I die even in desire of death.
> Still live in me this longing strife
> Of living death and dying life;
> For while Thou sweetly slayest me,
> Dead to myself I live in Thee."

The nearest poem to that in point of subject among Herbert's is the poem called *The Glance*, which contains the same general imagery of eyes and sun, but is written in a tone that would never allow itself such an epithet as "delicious."

"When first Thy sweet and gracious eye
Vouchsafed, even in the midst of youth and night,
To look upon me, who before did lie
Weltering in sin,
I felt a sugar'd, strange delight,
Passing all cordials made by any art,
Bedew, embalm, and overrun my heart,
And take it in.

"Since that time many a bitter storm
My soul hath felt; ev'n able to destroy,
Had the malicious and ill-meaning harm
His swing and sway.
But still, Thy sweet, original joy,
Sprung from Thine eye, did work within my soul,
And surging griefs, when they grew bold, control;
And get the day.

"If Thy first glance so powerful be,
A mirth but open'd and sealed up again;
What wonders shall we feel when we shall see
Thy full-ey'd love!
When Thou shalt look us out of pain;
And one aspect of Thine spend in delight
More than a thousand suns disburse in light
In heaven above."

No consideration of Herbert's *Temple*, however slight, must omit mention of that long and elaborate poem which he entitles *The Church Porch*, a series of gnomic quatrains on the conduct to be expected of a

Christian gentleman. While so many of the Puritan preachers and lecturers in Herbert's day were delectating their flocks with curious points of doctrine, "reasoning high," like Milton's philosophical devils—

> "Of providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate—
> Fix'd fate, free will, foreknowledge absolute;
> And found no end in wandering mazes lost";

with the result, to quote Milton again, that "their hungry sheep looked up and were not fed, but swollen with wind, rotted inwardly,"[1] Herbert tasks himself to apply to the particular faults of his own class a particular remedy. Sager and more appealing dissuasions from the sins of the flesh, sounder and more generous counsels on the conduct of life, were surely never penned. What could be better than this?

> "Art thou a magistrate? then be severe;
> If studious, copy fair what time hath blurr'd,
> Redeem Truth from his jaws; if soldier,
> Chase brave employments with a naked sword
> Throughout the world. Fool not; for all may have,
> If they dare try, a glorious life or grave."

I could wish that *The Church Porch* were printed separately and given to every boy in our public schools; it would advantage him more than hearing sermons. At any rate, *The Church Porch* is among

[1] The Italian ambassador of the day observed that "the common people of England were wiser than the wisest of his nation, for here the very women and shopkeepers were able to judge of predestination." As a natural consequence we have many testimonies to the decay of morals.

the best witnesses to the reasonable and practical spirit—the ἐπιείκεια and σωφροσύνη—characteristic of our communion.

I will call but one more witness—George Herbert's "dear and deserving brother," Nicholas Ferrar, who, the son of a merchant, and himself enjoying a wide reputation for skill in the management of affairs, took deacon's orders at the age of thirty-four, and retired with his mother and a large family of kinsfolk to the manor house of Little Gidding in Huntingdonshire, in order to live a life of prayer, contemplation, and alms-deeds. He had been allowed his degree at Cambridge before the statutory age in recognition of his mature scholarship, and had given special attention to Church history. Afterwards he travelled through Germany, Italy, and Spain, studying everywhere the customs of the Churches, and the effect of the customs upon life and manners; and he came back to England with clear convictions upon two points—first, that the soul of the Church was the worship of God, and that worship in England had been almost extinguished by controversy; secondly, that the Roman Mass did not, as its defenders alleged,[1] tend to real worship, but, on the contrary, was in its results even anti-Christian. His brother

[1] Cardinal Newman, in *Loss and Gain*, revived this specious plea, contending that Anglican worship was only *invocation* of God, whereas Roman worship was an *evocation;* but if God is a Spirit, why should a substantial presence be more worshipped than a spiritual presence?

records a saying of his about the Roman Mass, that if it were celebrated in his house he would pull down the room in which it had been said and build it up again. Nevertheless, Ferrar did not escape the charge of Popery; it was enough that he lived in a religious community, "an Arminian nunnery," as it was called. On the other hand, he was also taunted with Puritanism from the temperate mode of life practised at Gidding, so much at variance with the lavishness of the time, which reduced many old families to poverty. A very interesting letter has been preserved from a Mr. Lenton of Gray's Inn, who, like many other curious observers of the day, paid Gidding a visit, in which he gives a full description of the chapel and the service there. We learn that the holy table was not placed altarwise;[1] that the prayer-desk was made of the same height as the pulpit, in order that prayer might not be degraded below preaching in the estimation of the worshippers, as it too commonly was in those days;—Walton tells us that George Herbert made the same arrangement in the church he restored

[1] Mr. Shorthouse, who in his delightful romance of *John Inglesant* follows Lenton's letter closely, does not notice this detail; I should say he is justified in ignoring it, because the position of the table would have no controversial bearing. The point argued between the Roman and Anglican Churches at the time was not as to the fact of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, but as to its nature, whether commemorative or repeated and substantial. The east window, with the picture of the crucifixion, which is made to play a part in influencing Inglesant, is modern. The only painted glass in the church in Ferrar's day was a representation of the royal arms.

at Leighton;—and that the chapel was "fairly and sweetly adorned with herbs and flowers, and with tapers on every pillar." On the communion table stood "some plate, as a chalice, and candlesticks with wax candles." What most impressed the visitor was Ferrar's reverence in the church. "At the entering thereof he made a low obeisance; a few paces further a lower; coming to the half-pace (which was at the east end, where the table stood) he bowed to the ground, if not prostrated himself," giving afterwards as a reason that "God was more immediately present while we were worshipping Him in the Temple."

Ferrar's view of the peculiar position and tenets of the Church of England is indicated in the report preserved by his brother of the farewell discourse he addressed to the household at Gidding upon his death-bed: "Sunday [Nov. 5, 1637] he received the Communion which Mr. Groose administered, and before it made a most solemn and comfortable confession of his faith according to the Church of England, acknowledging his salvation to depend only upon the sweet and infinite mercies and sufferings of his most dear Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, excluding all other dependencies, saying, 'when all men had done all they could, they must wholly acknowledge and confess themselves most unworthy servants.' So with great desire and devotion he received the Blessed Sacrament with much joy; and

during all his sickness his speech tended to nothing but exhortations to love, fear, and serve God, as the only comfort and happiness of this world and [?] to the better. He often would exhort the family that 'they should steadfastly and constantly adhere to the doctrine of the Church of England, and to continue in the *good old way*, and in those they have been taught out of the Word of God, and in what he had accordingly informed them of, for it was the true, right, good way to heaven; that they should find oppositions and means used by those that they did not expect it from to withdraw them, to hinder, to divert them. But,' said he, 'I forewarn you to be constant, to be steadfast in the *good old way*. You will find danger and trouble, but shrink not, rely upon God, and serve Him in *sincerity of devotion, both in souls and bodies; God will have both, He made both, and both must worship Him in reverence and fear*. He is a great Lord God, as full of mercy, so of majesty. I am now going before Him, to give an account of what I have said to you and instructed you in. I again say, what I have taught you is according to His good will and heavenly Word, and out of it. Be you steadfast, and of good cheer; if you continue to serve Him, He will be your shield and defence to preserve you.'"[1]

May the words of the dying Ferrar find an echo in the hearts of all English Churchmen to-day!

[1] Mayor's *Ferrar*, p. 97.

IZAAK WALTON'S LIFE OF DONNE

IZAAK WALTON'S LIFE OF DONNE.

SINCE the death of Matthew Arnold there has been no literary critic to whose appearances in print the majority of educated people look forward with such assurance of satisfaction as to those of Mr. Leslie Stephen. His essays are always first-hand studies, giving the result of reading and reflection, and an insight which "looks quite through the deeds of men," while they are written in a style as sinewy as the thought, with no preciosity of phrase and no word to spare. If they are sometimes disappointing, it is because he sometimes elects to treat of people who interest him only on some particular side, while the rest of their character or achievement finds him cold or hostile. Such a person evidently is Donne, the famous Dean of St. Paul's, whom Mr. Stephen has lately discussed in a very brilliant article in the *National Review*,[1] taking occasion by Mr. Gosse's new *Life and Letters*. Donne was a puzzle, and therefore attractive to the psychologist, but he was also a poet and a preacher; and those people who value him in either of these aspects are not likely

[1] December, 1899.

to rise from the perusal of Mr. Stephen's paper in a very contented frame of mind. It is, however, only incidentally about Donne that I wish to speak in this humble remonstrance; the brief I have taken up is not on his behalf, but on behalf of his biographer Izaak Walton. Still, as the facts of his life form the material of Walton's biography, in vindicating the one I shall be vindicating the other.

After a dubious compliment to Walton's life of Donne as a prose idyl like *The Vicar of Wakefield*, "a charming narrative in which we have as little to do with the reality of Donne as with the reality of Dr. Primrose," Mr. Stephen puts his case against the book in a sentence: "There are two objections to the life if taken as a record of facts. The first is that the facts are all wrong, and the second that the portraiture is palpably false." The judgment could not be more severe, and if Mr. Stephen were treating directly of Walton it would have great weight, for it would then mean that he had investigated the question of Walton's trustworthiness for himself. As it is, I incline to think he has not done so, from the palpably false portraiture of the sentence which follows: "As we read we imagine Walton gazing reverently from his seat at the dean in the pulpit, dazzled by a vast learning and a majestic flow of elaborate rhetoric, which seemed to the worthy tradesman to come as from an 'angel in the clouds,' and offering a posthumous homage as sincere and

touching as that which, no doubt, engaged the condescending kindness of the great man in life." That sentence contains a radically false view of Walton's character and capabilities, and the relations of the two men to each other. To begin with, Mr. Stephen has not, perhaps, been aware that the phrase "an angel in the clouds," which he quotes from Walton,[1] is not Walton's own, but taken from one of Donne's poems, and is employed by Walton to express, not the preacher's relation to his flock, but the heavenly authority of his message. If that is recognized, the phrase, though it remains exaggerated, ceases to be ridiculous. Then, as for the "worthy tradesman." Undoubtedly Walton is often spoken of as "worthy" by his friends, and undoubtedly he had been a "tradesman," but his capability of appreciating Donne is not adequately summed up in the compound phrase; any more than the secret of the charm of the *Compleat Angler* is conveyed in Mr. Gosse's title of the "immortal piscatory linendraper."[2] Walton's marriage register declares him to have been an ironmonger. He was a freeman of the Ironmongers' Company, of which Donne's father had once been warden; and this fact may have implied a certain freemasonry in their relations. It is more important

[1] "Preaching the Word so, as showed his own heart was possessed by those very thoughts and joys that he laboured to distil into others; *a preacher in earnest:* always preaching *to himself*, like an Angel *from* a cloud but *in* none."

[2] Gosse's *Life of Donne*, ii. 253.

to insist that Walton was a man of education. His handwriting is beautiful and scholarlike, and his composition (like that of Shakespeare, who was also of yeoman descent and country schooling) might put to the blush a good deal for which a university has been answerable. He was a poet, and a friend of poets. A better proof that he was not a "worthy tradesman" in Mr. Stephen's unworthy sense is afforded by his friendship with country gentlemen of the stamp of Charles Cotton, who are not the least sensitive of men to distinctions of class, and who are not professionally obliged to meekness like the clergy, though even the Bishops of Winchester are not in the habit of offering free quarters in Farnham Castle to worthy tradesmen. A remark of Cotton's may be quoted as sufficient once for all to free Walton's character from any suspicion of servility: "My father Walton will be seen twice in no man's company he does not like, and likes none but such as he believes to be very honest men, which is one of the best arguments, or at least, of the best testimonies I have, that I either am or that he thinks me one of those, seeing I have not yet found him weary of me." Donne became Vicar of St. Dunstan's, the parish in which Walton lived, in 1624, and assuming, as we may,[1] that they became acquainted at that date,

[1] Mr. Gosse, for reasons which he does not give, "conjectures" that Walton did not enjoy the Dean's intimacy till 1629 or 1630 (Pref. p. xii.).

there were still seven years remaining before Donne's death, in which Walton would have had opportunities of studying his vicar from other points of view than from below the pulpit; and, indeed, their intimacy is proved by his receiving one of Donne's memorial seals,[1] and by his presence at Donne's bedside when he breathed his last. I plead, therefore, that Walton was a person capable of painting Donne's portrait, and with ample opportunities of studying his subject.

In the next place I will endeavour to show that the likeness is a good one; in other words, that the salient facts are all right, and the character accurately drawn. For this purpose, it will be convenient to desert Mr. Stephen for the moment, and turn to Mr. Gosse on whom he has relied, so as to examine any charges Donne's most recent biographer has to make against his predecessor. "In the days of Walton," says Mr. Gosse, "of course what we now call conscientious biography was unknown." Again he says, Walton's life is "too rose-coloured and too inexact for scientific uses."[2] And again, the inaccuracies are "so many, that it is beyond the power of mere annotation to remove them." I cannot think that by "conscientious biography" Mr. Gosse means what I should mean by that expression, and I do not know what the "scientific uses" of a biography may be,

[1] Other recipients were Sir Henry Wotton, the Bishops of Norwich, Salisbury, and Chichester, and George Herbert.

[2] Pref. p. viii.

so that I will not attempt any discussion on this part of his indictment; but in regard to his other charges a direct issue can be joined. I will, therefore, make a summary of the inaccuracies Mr. Gosse has pointed out in Walton, to see if they indeed transcend the power of annotation to correct, and then I will examine the question of "rose-colour."

1. In his account of Donne's marriage and consequent dismissal from Sir Thomas Egerton's secretaryship, Walton speaks of Egerton as Lord Ellesmere, which he did not become till later. Also he represents the father-in-law, Sir George More, as asking his sister, who was Egerton's wife, to interfere and get Donne discharged, whereas she died in the year before Donne's marriage. This is undoubtedly a blunder of Walton's. I suspect the appeal to Lady Egerton to effect Donne's dismissal, of which Walton must have been told, referred to the early days of Donne's courtship, and strengthens Walton's assertion, which Mr. Gosse unreasonably doubts, that Sir George More "had some intimation" of what was going forward.

2. Walton gives the cause of Sir Robert Drury's excursion to the continent, on which Donne was his companion, as "a sudden resolution to accompany Lord Hay on an embassy to the French King Henry IV.," whereas it appears from Chamberlain's correspondence with Carleton that Sir Robert did not travel till the year after Henry's assassination.

3. Walton believed that the University of Cambridge gave Donne his doctor's degree with "gladness;" but we learn from a letter of Carleton's that the Vice-Chancellor did not consent without much pressure from the King.

4. Walton misdates the *Autumnal*, a poem written by Donne upon George Herbert's mother. The point of the poem is that the lady was in the autumn of her beauty—*pulchrorum autumnus pulcher*, as Bacon says—and of this Walton is not oblivious, for he says "both he and she were then past the meridian of man's life." But he connects the poem with their first meeting at Oxford, which could not have been later than 1600, when Magdalen Herbert would have been only thirty-two. Mr. Gosse, it may be remarked, does some violence to the poem itself by dating it as late as 1625, when she would have been fifty-seven; for Donne himself gives fifty as the age he had in his mind for the autumn of life.

5. This must be given in Mr. Gosse's own words: "One of the most curious facts about the life of Donne as written for us so charmingly by Izaak Walton is the extraordinary tissue of errors, circumstantially recorded, in the pages where he describes the poet's entrance into holy orders. . . . The page in which Walton describes the circumstances of Donne's ordination contains scarcely a statement which is historically correct; neither the date, nor the conditions, nor the company are those which

are given us by contemporary documents." But immediately after these very sweeping charges Mr. Gosse adds:[1] "And yet it is probable that in the attitude of the King to Donne, and in the conversations recorded, we may safely follow Walton. These would seem to Donne himself to be the really essential matters" (ii. 57). Certainly, and to us also. We may note, however, that for the King's attitude to Donne we are not left to the testimony of Walton, for Donne himself, in the eighth expostulation of his *Devotions*, tells us in the plainest language that the King "first of any man conceived a hope that I might be of some use in [the] Church, and descended to an intimation, to a persuasion, almost to a solicitation that I would embrace that calling." But to come to Mr. Gosse's apparently specific, but very puzzling, charges of inaccuracy as to the "date, conditions, and company" [?] of Donne's ordination. Date in Walton there is none at all. He says only that Donne deferred his ordination for "almost three years" after the interview

[1] One remarkable virtue of Mr. Gosse as a biographer is his candour. I shall have in what follows to quote him against himself more than once. Another case in which his conscience has obliged him to withdraw a serious charge immediately after making it occurs in i. 96; the italics are mine: "The complexion which Donne, *looking back from the sanctity of old age* to this period of his youth, *desired to be* thrown upon the *compromising* episode of his clandestine courtship is no doubt reflected by Izaak Walton. The letters of Donne from prison in 1602 *confirm in the main his later recollections*." In the Preface (p. xii.), where Mr. Gosse makes the same charge at greater length, he forgets to withdraw it.

in which the King urged it; and he puts this interview at some unspecified time "after" 1610. As Donne was ordained in January, 1615, this important interview must therefore, according to Walton, have taken place in 1612. It seems to be this date that Mr. Gosse finds fault with. He has discovered a letter of December 3, 1614, in which Donne, mentioning an interview he has just had with the King at Newmarket, says: "I have received from the King as good allowance and encouragement to pursue my purpose as I could desire." Mr. Gosse thinks this interview must have followed immediately upon the important one referred to by Donne and Walton, which he accordingly dates "about the 20th Nov. 1614"—*i.e.* two years later than Walton puts it.[1] But the supposition is altogether gratuitous; and, what is more, it does not fit the expressions of Mr. Gosse's new document, in the interest of which it is made. If Donne, after hearing the King's advice, had, as Mr. Gosse suggests, asked for a few days to think the matter over, and had then returned with his scruples for the King to overrule, he would not have spoken of receiving "as good *allowance* to pursue *my* purpose *as I could desire*." While admitting, then, that Walton's account of these events would be improved by a

[1] Walton's chronology is clearer in his first edition. In the second he somewhat confuses his narrative by introducing the story of Carr's summoning Donne to Theobalds into a parenthesis.

few dates, I cannot see that Mr. Gosse has pointed out any error in it. His own account is an imaginative piece of work, which is supported by no evidence, and breaks down where it can be tested.

6. Another accusation Mr. Gosse brings against Walton is that he overcharges the picture of the scene at the funeral sermon which Donne preached over his wife. This is what Walton says: "His first motion from his house was to preach where his beloved wife lay buried—in St. Clement's Church, near Temple Bar, London—and his text was a part of the prophet Jeremy's Lamentation: '*Lo, I am the man that have seen affliction.*' And, indeed, his very words and looks testified him to be truly such a man; and they, with the addition of his sighs and tears, expressed in his sermon, did so work upon the affections of his hearers as melted and moulded them into a companionable sadness." On which Mr. Gosse comments as follows: "The printed copy which has come down to us says that it was delivered at St. Dunstan's. . . . An examination of the sermon itself reveals no such emotional or hysterical appeals to sympathy as the sentimental genius of Walton conceived." Mr. Gosse's examination of the sermon preached at St. Dunstan's ought to have revealed the fact that it is not a funeral sermon at all, and so cannot have been the one that Donne preached over his wife, which was probably not written down. That Donne was likely to apply the

passage in *Lamentations* to himself we may see from his poetical version of it. And it is uncritical to charge Donne's tears upon Walton's sentimentality, when Walton tells us in his *Life of Herbert* that *he saw* Donne "*weep* and preach [Lady Danvers's] funeral sermon" in 1627. If Donne wept at his friend's sermon of commemoration, he may be credited with weeping at his wife's.

7. Walton thought Donne succeeded Dr. Gataker as Preacher at Lincoln's Inn, but Dr. Holloway came in between.

8. Mr. Gosse dismisses as incredible Walton's story, that Donne was offered fourteen benefices "in the first year of his entering into sacred orders;" but we know that when Nicholas Ferrar was made deacon he was offered benefices on all hands, and Donne had many friends.[1]

Such, then, being Walton's alleged errors, some of which are proved, it will be seen that these are of the sort which were inevitable when there were no dictionaries for verifying dates within reach of the hand; and there is nothing in them "beyond the power of mere annotation to remove." They do not affect the portrait. The further question remains,

[1] There is good reason for always, in such cases, giving Walton the benefit of any doubt. It used to be said, for example (as by Dr. Gardiner, vii. 268), that Walton was misinformed in his assertion that George Herbert took deacon's orders some years before he became Rector of Bemerton. But in 1893 documents were discovered which showed that there was an interval of four years between the diaconate (1626) and the priesthood (1630).

whether Walton has not robbed that of its truthfulness by a lavish use of madder, or by leaving out "the warts." Mr. Gosse thinks he has; and his charges in this respect must now be considered.

1. "Walton in his exquisite portrait of his friend has nothing at all to say of the stormy and profane youth which led up to that holy maturity of faith and unction. He chose to ignore or to forget anything which might seem to dim the sacred lustre of the exemplary Dean of St. Paul's." This is a categorical statement; but, having made it, Mr. Gosse's literary conscience turns restlessly in its dreams, and he adds: "Yet even Walton admitted that Donne 'was by nature highly passionate,' and doubtless he was well aware that below the sanctity of his age lay a youth scored with frailty and the injuries of instinct" (i. 63). *Doubtless he was well aware!* It is not till sixteen pages further on that Mr. Gosse's conscience quite wakes up, and he quotes from Walton what Walton himself says about Donne's youth: "It is a truth that in his *penitential* years viewing some of those pieces that had been loosely (*God knows too loosely*) scattered in his youth, he wished they had been abortive, or so short-lived that his own eyes had witnessed their funerals." To call a man's age "penitential," if words have any meaning, is not "to ignore" his youth, but to sharply characterize it. But this is not all that Walton has to say about it. He characterizes it in still plainer terms to all persons

of education in the following sentence: "Now the English Church had gained a second St. Austin; *for I think none was so like him before his conversion*, none so like St. Ambrose after it; and *if his youth had the infirmities of the one*, his age had the excellencies of the other." He also contrasts Donne's position as Preacher at Lincoln's Inn with his wild conduct there as a student: "In this time of sadness he was importuned by the grave Benchers of Lincoln's Inn, who were once the companions and friends of his youth, to accept of their Lecture—of which he accepted, being most glad to renew his intermitted friendship with those whom he so much loved, and where he had been a Saul,—though not to persecute Christianity or to deride it, *yet in his irregular youth to neglect the visible practice of it*, there to become a Paul, and preach salvation to his beloved brethren." And even that is not all, for Walton records the reason that Donne himself gave to Morton, afterwards Bishop of Durham, for declining to take orders in 1607: "I dare make so dear a friend as you are my confessor. Some *irregularities* of my life have been so visible to some men, that though I have, I thank God, made my peace with Him by *penitential resolutions* against them, and by the assistance of His grace banished them my affections, yet this which God knows to be so, is not so visible to man, as to free me from their censures, and it may be that sacred calling from a dishonour."

It seems to me that a biographer could not be expected to go further than this in laying in the shadows. But how was he to do so even if he wished? Mr. Gosse has elected to go further by treating the "loose" poems of Donne's youth as biographical material, and has fared worse by discovering a mare's nest.[1]

2. A second wart that Mr. Gosse has represented in realistic colours is the story of Donne's relations with the King's favourite, Carr, Earl of Somerset. Probably all that Walton knew of these relations was the story already referred to, which he added in his second edition, of Carr's summoning Donne to Court and promising him the vacant place of Clerk to the Council. Mr. Gosse, following Dr. Jessopp,[2] has printed several letters from Donne to Somerset, which leave no doubt that Donne sought his patronage and accepted his pay; and that Carr for a time deterred

[1] It is impossible in a short compass to examine the love story that Mr. Gosse has concocted out of Donne's elegies and lyrics. It may be sufficient to point out that the *dramatis personæ* which he borrows from the first elegy—the lover, the married woman, and the jealous husband—do not recur in the others. In only two elegies out of twenty is there mention of a husband, while in the fourth there figures an "hydroptic father," who, as third actor in such a domestic drama, is plainly inconsistent with the "jealous husband," since a woman cannot be both married and unmarried. The elegies, in fact, are entirely independent of each other; one is the famous *Autumnal* addressed to George Herbert's mother. It may also be pointed out that Mr. Gosse depends for the climax of his story upon a mistaken paraphrase of a passage in the thirteenth elegy.

[2] *Life of Donne* (*Leaders of Religion* series), an excellent sketch. See pp. 74, 81.

him from taking orders by the promise of some diplomatic appointment. Now these are undoubtedly new facts. But how do they affect Walton's portrait? Already in Walton, Carr figures as a patron, and as patron seeking to dispense lay preferment, while the King insists that any preferment Donne receives shall be clerical. Mr. Gosse's accusation of having devilled for Somerset in the miserable business of the Essex divorce has been already shown by a writer in the *Athenæum*[1] to rest upon a confusion with Sir Daniel Donne, the Dean of Arches.

3. A third accusation that Mr. Gosse makes against Donne, of which Walton certainly gives no hint, is that he took orders from unworthy motives. Mr. Gosse does not hold that all Donne's clerical life was a sham; he believes that his wife's death two years after his ordination had a transfiguring effect upon his character. In this matter I confess to preferring the psychology of Mr. Stephen. "In 1617,"

[1] *Athenæum*, December 16, 1899. It is almost incredible that the sole basis for this very serious charge should be the following reference in Hist. MSS. Comm. 8th Report, pt. iii. p. 22*b*: "Earl of Ashburnham's MSS. No. 95. Miscellaneous legal collections. A quarto of 300 written pages of the reign of Charles II., containing amongst other matters *Dr. Donne's* compendium of the whole course of proceeding in the nullity of the marriage of the Earl of Essex and the Lady Frances Howard, 1613." Happily, the compendium exists among the Harleian MSS. (39*f*. 416). Mr. Gosse, though he gives the reference (ii. 28), does not seem to have looked at the MS., which is headed "A discourse written by Sr. Daniell Dunn, doctor of the civill lawe." But the mistake was originally made by Dr. Jessopp (*Dict. of Nat. Biog.*, xv. 228), from whom Mr. Gosse has borrowed it.

he says, "the patient suffering wife was taken from him; and Donne was a man to feel the whole force of the blow. Preferments and success and life itself, he knew too well, would be henceforth sad and colourless." That seems to me to express exactly the effect a loss of the kind would have upon a middle-aged man of the character Mr. Gosse describes. It would take the taste out of success, but it would not make him a saint; and Mr. Stephen consistently holds that Donne never was a saint, or anything near it. Mr. Gosse's evidence for his view, as he resumes it in the *Athenæum* (December 9, 1899), is as follows: "In every word that I find written by or about[1] Donne from January 1615 to the winter of 1617, I discover a decency, but no ardour; a conventional piety, but no holy zeal; no experience of spiritual joy; no humility before God. After the death of his wife I find all these gifts in their full fruition. I am therefore forced to conclude that in the winter of 1617 Donne passed through a crisis of what is called 'conversion;' that he became sanctified and illuminated in a sense in which he had not been sanctified before." Well, that seems a plain enough statement; the only difficulty in examining it lies in the paucity of literary matter that can safely be attributed to that

[1] I take "about" to be a rhetorical flourish. At any rate, the sole contemporary reference to Donne for that period quoted by Mr. Gosse is a rude sneer in a letter of John Chamberlain, the Horace Walpole of those days, which Mr. Gosse himself deprecates (ii. 84).

interval. I have shown elsewhere[1] that the letters to Donne's private friends assigned by Mr. Gosse to those years must be earlier. There remains, however, a letter to his mother "comforting her after the death of her daughter" (Gosse, ii. 88). That letter is altogether too sacred to bandy about in controversy, but a critic who should label it "conventional" and "decent" would put himself out of court. I can only think that it had slipped Mr. Gosse's memory as he wrote. Of sermons before Mrs. Donne's death there remain very few—one preached in 1615, one in 1616, and two or perhaps three in the early part of 1617. Now, sermon-writing is an art, which, like any other, requires time and practice for its acquisition; and when a man takes orders late in life, however skilful he may have been in other ways, he finds he has to serve an apprenticeship to his new craft. One notices this in schoolmasters who take orders. As was to be anticipated, then, Donne's earliest sermons are somewhat stiff and over-methodical—too full of divisions, of authorities, of illustrations from Donne's legal learning. Still they are not wanting in passages of as earnest a piety as we find later. I had marked certain places to extract when I came upon a passage in Mr. Gosse's book (ii. 115) which acquitted me of the labour, for with his usual candour he characterizes one of them—that preached at St. Paul's Cross, March 24, 1617—as "a singularly dignified and

[1] *Athenæum*, December 2, 1899.

impassioned appeal for purity and cleanness of heart." Now, if an impassioned appeal for purity is to be reckoned "conventional piety," the more of such conventions we have the better. Before passing from this subject of Donne's alleged conversion in the winter of 1617, I may point out that the *Holy Sonnets*, which Mr. Gosse assigns to that date, lend no support to his theory. Mr. Gosse says they "attribute his condition of mind, softened and crushed so as to receive the impress of God's signet, to the agony caused by his bereavement."[1] But here, as earlier in his memoir,[2] Mr. Gosse has allowed his theories to blind him to the plain meaning of words, and his paraphrases cannot be accepted. The following is the sonnet Mr. Gosse has in mind :—

> "O ! might those sighs and tears return again
> Into my breast and eyes, which I have spent,
> That I might in this holy discontent
> Mourn with some fruit, as I have mourned in vain.
> In my idolatry what showers of rain
> Mine eyes did waste? what grief my heart did rent?
> That sufferance was my sin, now I repent
> Because I *did* suffer, I *must* suffer, pain.
> Th' hydroptic drunkard, and night-scouting thief,
> The itchy letcher, and self-tickling proud,
> Have the remembrance of past joys for relief
> Of coming ills. To poor me is allowed
> No ease ; for long yet vehement grief hath been
> Th' effect and cause, the punishment and sin."

The general sense is that in old days he wept long and vehemently in his passions of unholy love, but

[1] Gosse, ii. 107. [2] *Ibid.* i. 70.

such weeping was sin, and though it was also suffering, it must be punished by more suffering, namely, long and vehement sorrow for his sin. And he expresses the wish that all the tears he once spent so idly might be returned to him, to be spent now with profit. Mr. Gosse, however, paraphrases as follows: "He fears lest this natural affection [for his wife] may have taken an excessive fleshly form, may have been 'idolatry.' Yet this temporal sorrow has wrought in him a 'holy discontent,' which is obviously salutary." I do not think there is any reference here to Donne's wife; the phrase "in my idolatry" must be construed as the same phrase in the thirteenth sonnet—

> "as in my idolatry,
> I said to all my profane mistresses," etc.

There is one sonnet, it should be mentioned, first printed by Mr. Gosse, which does make clear mention of Donne's wife, but it attributes Donne's conversion to her influence in life, not to grief at her death—

> "Since she whom I loved hath paid her last debt
> To Nature, and to her's and my good is dead,
> And her soul early into heaven vanished,
> Wholly on heavenly things my mind is set.
> *Here the admiring her my mind did whet*
> *To seek Thee, God; so streams do show their head;*
> But tho' I have found Thee, and Thou my thirst hast fed,
> A holy thirsty dropsy melts me yet."

I must say, then, that I do not think Mr. Gosse has made out his case for any such fundamental

change as he describes in Donne, subsequent to and in consequence of his wife's death. Walton's picture of the effect of that blow, the greatest that can befall any man, is far more convincing. And if this theory of Mr. Gosse's, like his other novelties, falls to the ground, it follows that while his volumes must always be valuable for their work upon the letters, and the critical essays with which they conclude, we must still betake ourselves for a portrait of the "real Donne" to the unconscientious and unscientific Walton.

It remains to inquire whether Mr. Stephen, in places where he is not merely following Mr. Gosse, but giving his own independent judgment, supplies any adequate reasons for doubting Walton's skill as a draughtsman. Mr. Stephen makes two or three criticisms about which a word must be said.

1. The first concerns Walton's comment upon Donne's marriage. I quote from Mr. Stephen. "'His marriage,' says the worthy Walton, 'was the remarkable error of his life.' In spite of his ability in maintaining paradoxes, he was 'very far from justifying it,' and, indeed, 'would occasionally condemn himself for it.' To us who are at a different point of view, it is the one passage in Donne's life which gives us an unequivocal reason for loving him." Having administered this snub to poor Walton, Mr. Stephen goes on himself to qualify Donne's marriage as a "clandestine match with a girl of sixteen who lived in his patron's house." Now, it is perfectly

evident in the context that the "worthy Walton" means exactly what Mr. Stephen means, that it was an indefensible error to make a clandestine match with your patron's ward, an error that in the event drew after it a lifelong misery. Walton recognizes, as heartily as Mr. Stephen, that Donne's love was no error. He says of him in one place, "He—*I dare not say unhappily*—fell into such a liking, as with her approbation increased into a love;" and in another place, "God blessed them with so mutual and cordial affections as in the midst of their sufferings made their bread of sorrow taste more pleasantly than the banquets of *dull and low-spirited people*." Thus the "worthy Walton." Could even Mr. Stephen have put the point better?

2. A second criticism concerns Walton's report of the reasons which Morton alleged were given him by Donne for declining his advice to take orders in 1607; they have been in part quoted above (p. 101). Mr. Gosse will not accept them because they interfere with his theory that Donne had no religion till ten years later; Mr. Stephen will not accept them, partly because he thinks Morton's account too circumstantial to be true[1]—"The more 'circumstantial' an old

[1] Walton tells us that Morton was ninety-four in 1658, when he was preparing his second edition of Donne's Life; he does not say he was ninety-four when he gave him this report. The probability is rather that corrections and additional facts would be communicated to Walton immediately after the appearance of his first edition in 1640, when Morton would have been only seventy-six; and at seventy-six bishops are credible witnesses.

gentleman of ninety-four is about events half a century old, the less I believe in his exactness"—partly because he considers Donne's reason was merely the fear of adverse comment—"His obvious thirst for sympathy and respect would naturally make him shrink from a step certain to be misinterpreted; if, indeed, we should not rather say, to be too truly interpreted." A sufficient answer to which speculation seems to be, first, that though old men forget, their memory is always more accurate about events half a century old than about those nearer their own age; and the kind of thing an old man would not forget would be the reason his brilliant young friend had given him for not taking his advice; and secondly, that though Donne no doubt dreaded adverse comment, for according to the account in question he said so (and we know that when he did take orders, it came as he foresaw), there is nothing, except the resolute refusal to allow Donne any religion, to show that the other reasons he gave had not equal weight with him. I confess I cannot help wondering at a critic of Mr. Stephen's exactness following Mr. Gosse so trustfully as to say, apparently on no authority but his, that at this time Donne "showed but little religious feeling." For it happens, curiously enough, to be a time at which we have unusual and quite remarkable evidence of his religious feeling. First of all, there are a series of private letters to his most intimate friend, Sir Henry Goodyer, from whom

nothing was to be gained by any pose, which show, if words mean anything, a very real earnestness. Here is a passage from one written in 1607: "You know I never fettered nor imprisoned the word religion, not straitening it friarly *ad religiones factitias* as the Romans call well their orders of *religion*, not immuring it in a Rome, or a Wittenburg, or a Geneva; they are all virtual beams of one sun, and whereso-ever they find clay hearts, they harden them and moulder them into dust; and they entender and mollify waxen. . . . Religion is Christianity, which being too spiritual to be seen by us, doth therefore take an apparent body of good life and works; so salvation requires an honest Christian. These are the two elements; and he which is elemented from these hath the complexion of a good man and a fit friend."

Here is a passage upon controversy: "To you that are not easily scandalized, and in whom, I hope, neither my religion nor morality can suffer, I dare write my opinion of that book [a book of controversy on the Anglican side] in whose bowels you left me. It hath refreshed and given new justice to my ordinary complaint, that the divines of these times are become mere advocates, as though religion were a temporal inheritance; they plead for it with all sophistications and illusions and forgeries, and herein are they likest advocates, that though they be feed by the way with dignities and other recompenses,

yet that for which they plead is none of theirs. *They write for religion without it.*"

Here is a passage about a gentleman's sudden death: "A chaplain came up to him, to whom he delivered an account of his understanding, and I hope of his belief, and soon after died. Perchance his life needed a longer sickness, but a man may go faster and safer when he enjoys that daylight of a clear and sound understanding than in the night or twilight of an ague or other disease. And the grace of Almighty God doth everything suddenly and hastily except depart from us; it enlightens us, warms us, feasts us, ravishes us at once. Such a medicine, I fear, his inconsideration needed, and I hope as confidently that he had it."

And here is a salutation at the close of a letter from his sick bed: "Sir, you would pity me if you saw me write, and therefore will pardon me if I write no more; my pain hath drawn my head so much awry, and holds it so that mine eye cannot follow mine hand. I receive you therefore into my prayers with mine own weary soul, and commend myself to yours."

These passages are all from letters to Sir Henry Goodyer in the years 1607–8. Milton tells us that only one eye can penetrate hypocrisy, and no one, therefore, can assert that these passages may not be the well-turned periods of a hypocrite; but hypocrisy has some end to serve, and until I can be shown what

end it could serve in Donne's case, I shall believe that he was writing to his dearest friend what was really in his heart. In addition to these letters to Sir Henry Goodyer, we have one of July 11, 1607, to George Herbert's mother enclosing certain "holy hymns and sonnets." Walton tells us that the hymns even in his day were lost, but says nothing as to the sonnets. They may have been some of those which we still possess, for no ingenuity can fit these into a series. As Mr. Gosse, however, dates them all after 1617, I will not contest the point, which cannot be determined, but will instance instead some verses which he himself allows to be of this time, and censures as "frigid," as "ingenious exercises in metrical theology," "clever," but "without unction." As one of them, the *Litany*, was composed on what Donne took to be his death-bed, we may hesitate to accept Mr. Gosse's description.[1] But as in any case it would be impolite, as well as futile, merely to put my opinion against his, I will call in Dr. George MacDonald, who in questions of religious poetry is the best critic we have. It happens that the very poem, that on *The Resurrection*, which Mr. Gosse

[1] It may be interesting to see how the *Litany* impressed a contemporary. Izaak Walton writes of it—

> "Did he—fit for such penitents as she
> And he to use—leave us a Litany
> Which all devout men love, and doubtless shall,
> As times grow better, grow more classical?"

picks out for censure, Dr. MacDonald chooses as a specimen "of Donne's best, and at the same time of his most characteristic mode of presenting fine thoughts grotesquely attired."[1] Especially he notices the line,

> "He was all gold when he lay down, but rose
> All tincture,"[2]

which so offends Mr. Gosse (i. 264), as "almost grand;" and we may add that if the use of so chemical a figure is to convict Donne of a want of genuine religious feeling, it must be allowed the same efficacy against George Herbert who borrows it.

3. A further criticism of Mr. Stephen's relates to the change which, according to Walton, came over Donne at his ordination. Mr. Stephen seems to understand Walton to say that the change was something miraculous. "Donne," says Mr. Stephen, "the wit, the poet, and the courtier, was transformed at a bound into the saint, and a burning and shining light of the Church. Are we to reduce or qualify this ardent panegyric? It shows what Donne became in the eyes of Walton. Was there a corresponding change in the man himself?" It will be safer in answering Mr. Stephen's question to have the whole

[1] *England's Antiphon*, p. 124.

[2] *Tincture* was a substance which could transmute baser metals into gold; so that the sense of the line is, in Dr. MacDonald's words, "Entirely good when he died, he was something yet greater when he rose, for he had gained the power of making others good."

"ardent panegyric" before us in Walton's own words. He says: "And now all his studies, which had been occasionally diffused, were all concentered in Divinity. *Now he had a new calling, new thoughts, and a new employment for his wit and eloquence. Now all his earthly affections were changed into divine love; and all the faculties of his own soul were engaged in the conversion of others;* in preaching the glad tidings of remission to repentant sinners and peace to each troubled soul. To these he applied himself with all care and diligence; and now such a change was wrought in him, that he could say with David, O how amiable are Thy tabernacles, O Lord God of Hosts! Now he declared openly that when he required a temporal, God gave him a spiritual blessing. And that he was now gladder to be a doorkeeper in the House of God than he could be to enjoy the noblest of all temporal employments."

Of this "panegyric," which is really no panegyric at all, Mr. Stephen quotes only the sentences I have italicized. I do not think even by themselves they could bear the interpretation he puts upon them.[1] Certainly in their context they cannot. There is no suggestion that Donne was "transformed at a bound nto the saint." The change described is a change not of character but of interest and employment.

[1] Perhaps Mr. Stephen understood *divine love* to mean "love of God," but the context shows the sense to be "spiritual affection for men."

Like George Herbert afterwards, Donne had thought that his talents would find their best scope in some secular office; but also, like Herbert, when he made up his mind to take orders, he threw himself into his new calling heart and soul, and soon found that it suited his powers better than he had feared. He did not regret his decision, but was thankful for it, though it was come to with some reluctance. That is all that Walton says. Mr. Stephen's criticism would really imply that there is no such thing as a religious layman.

4. Perhaps the unkindest cut that Mr. Stephen makes at Donne's character is to twit him with his dependence upon patronage and his keen eye for the main chance. Of course Mr. Stephen says nothing brutal. He is a master of the art of damning with the faintest possible dispraise; and recommends to mercy in the very act of putting on the black cap. He knows all the facts, makes every allowance, acknowledges that the seventeenth-century conditions of life differed from our own, and that Donne's "prospects depended entirely upon his power of attracting patrons," and yet, for all he can do, his virtue will ooze out of him in such sentences as "the story is not altogether attractive," "a process which involved some trial of self-respect," "the weakness becomes something worse." Let us recall the facts. Here was a man, by birth and breeding a gentleman, thrown upon the world by an imprudent marriage;

trained for the law but far more interested in theology, and yet by his Romanist antecedents and also by a wild youth held back from taking orders; how was he to live? He was a poet, but poetry had no market. There were then no reviews to edit or write in. The only possible chance was to obtain some private post from a private patron, or some public post by conciliating the King's favourite courtier. Pride should have withheld him? What right has a man to pride who has a wife and seven children? But he did dirty work for Somerset! No, that is a fable of Dr. Jessopp's and Mr. Gosse's, which it will take long to kill. At least he wrote two panegyrics in memory of a young girl whom he had never seen? That is true; they are hyperbole run mad, so mad that they cease to be panegyrics of any human being; but though Donne's eccentric taste in writing them may be censured, no moral blame can be imputed. They were his rent to the girl's father for house and home; and they contain some of the finest lines in the English language. Surely the only allowable attitude to insufferable dependence of this sort is pity.

"Full little knowest thou, that hast not tried,
What hell it is in suing long to bide,
To lose good days that might be better spent,
To waste long nights in pensive discontent;
To speed to-day, to be put back to-morrow,
To feed on hope, to pine with fear and sorrow;
To fret thy soul with crosses and with cares;
To eat thy heart through comfortless despairs;
To fawn, to crouch, to wait, to ride, to run,
To spend, to give, to want, to be undone."

Spenser, who wrote that in the comparatively spacious days of Queen Elizabeth, was certainly more fortunate than Donne in the type of courtier upon whom he depended, but he was every bit as dependent as Donne and liked dependence as little, and was as much or as little to blame for its necessity. In those days nothing but a private fortune could keep a man's back as erect as he would have wished it to be, and as Mr. Stephen and every one else would wish it to have been.

After Donne took orders, Mr. Stephen's high moral superiority over the poor courtier's effort to keep his family from starvation becomes reinforced by the perennial layman's sneer at the mercenariness of the clergy. "Donne," he says, "did not throw over the world to retire to a cloister. He accepted preferments, and though we must of course admit the normal reference to the 'standard of the age,' he does not appear to have been more or less averse than other clergymen of the day to a comfortable addition to his income involving no increase of duty. According to one of Walton's anecdotes, he rejected a profitable bargain, because it involved something like sacrilege. *But Donne oddly adds, that he rejects it because he is dangerously ill, and will thankfully accept it if he recovers.*" Oddly, indeed! If Mr. Stephen's contempt for Walton and readiness to believe any meanness of Donne had permitted him to read a second time the anecdote to which he

refers, he must have seen that he had completely failed to understand it; and if he had understood it he would have seen that he might have cancelled his admission of "the normal reference to the standard of the age;" since the only point of the anecdote is that Donne was more averse than other clergymen of his day to drawing professional payment for services which he did not render. The story is this. A lease of some property belonging to the Canons of St. Paul's had fallen in, and the amount of the fine to be paid for its renewal was under discussion, when Donne fell ill. As the tenant was well-to-do, the Chapter (including Donne) had rejected his first offer as inadequate; but when the seriousness of Donne's illness was known, the senior canon came to him (for Donne, it must be remembered, was a residentiary canon as well as dean, and so pecuniarily interested in the question), suggesting that the proposed fine should be accepted if the tenant could not at once be induced to increase it, rather than Donne's chance of sharing in it should be imperilled by prolonging the negotiation. We have to bear in mind that the value of property then lay much more in these fines than in the rent, which was usually low; so that while it would have been undoubtedly generous of the remaining residentiaries to abate some of their claim rather than Donne's estate should suffer, it would not have been unreasonable in Donne to have expected them to do so.

Donne, however, declined the offer, on the ground that to accept it would be (for him) of the nature of sacrilege; not, of course, in the ordinary sense of the word, in which it means the holding of Church estate by laymen, but in a sense of Donne's own. He had asked himself, so he told Dr. King, who came with the proposal, what the primitive *clergy* meant by *their* dread of committing sacrilege, and the answer he had given himself was, "It is sacrilege to accept Church emolument without performing service for it." Of course Donne would mean by deputy, if not in person. In this case, if he should not recover, he would be receiving the money not for himself, but for his heirs, who could do no service in the cathedral. But all this is quite obvious on the surface of the anecdote, and how both Mr. Gosse and Mr. Stephen should have entirely missed it is very puzzling. The passage from Walton is too long to quote, but a paragraph from it is given below,[1] for

[1] "*Our times abound with men that are busy and litigious about trifles and Church ceremonies, and yet so far from scrupling sacrilege, that they make not so much as a quære what it is: but I thank God I have; and I dare not now upon my sick-bed, when Almighty God hath made me useless to the service of the Church, make any advantages out of it. But if He shall again restore me to such a degree of health as again to serve at His altar I shall then gladly take the reward which the bountiful benefactors of this church have designed me; for God knows my children and relations will need it. In which number my mother, whose credulity and charity has contracted a very plentiful to a very narrow estate, must not be forgotten. But Dr. King, if I recover not, that little worldly estate that I shall leave behind me,—that very little, when divided into eight parts,—must, if you deny me not so charitable a favour, fall into your*

the sake of the proof it affords that Donne, notwithstanding that he had, as Mr. Stephen says, "accepted preferments," had not very effectually feathered his nest. I think the reader will agree that the very ring of the words ought to have saved Donne from the shameful imputation of being ready to commit sacrilege as soon as he was well enough. I may add that the anecdote must have come from Dr. King himself, who, when Bishop of Chichester, signs himself in a letter to Walton, "Your ever faithful and affectionate old friend."

There are not a few other points in Mr. Stephen's picture of Donne to which exception might be taken. For example, the exaggerated reverence of the Jacobean clergy for the King is not a matter that can be dismissed in a sentence with a light suggestion of insincerity; its explanation lies a good deal in the substitution of the Royal for the Papal supremacy as the keystone of the ecclesiastical building; but in those days kings were almost worshipped even by laymen. Is it quite fair, too, because in a sermon on the text "He that loveth pureness of heart, the king shall be his friend," Donne presses purity on the courtiers before him, not only on the highest grounds, but as a recommendation for the service of the State,

hands, as my most faithful friend and executor, of whose care and justice I make no more doubt, than of God's blessing, on that which I have conscientiously collected for them; but it shall not be augmented on my sick-bed; and this I declare to be my unalterable resolution."

to turn round on him and say, "Nobody knew better than Donne what was the moral purity of the favourites who had been rewarded by James's friendship"? We are too apt to suppose that all the information we have now gleaned from State papers and private letters and memoirs was at the service of those who lived in the thick of the events. It would be a hard matter to prove Donne's acquaintance with the character of Somerset before his fall. That in his youth Donne wrote general satires against the Court proves nothing. But allowing him to have been exceptionally well informed, could he have found a better text than this for preaching at King as well as courtiers without risk of treason?

This apology, however, is already too long, and I must only slightly touch upon the final point in which Mr. Stephen is inclined to doubt Walton's testimony, especially as he does so with unusual diffidence. Referring to Walton's description of Donne's preaching, he says, "Such performances might be amazing feats of intellectual juggling; but could they produce 'raptures' and 'tears'? I can manage to believe it, though I confess I have rather to take it on trust." Mr. Stephen's analysis of the merits of these sermons on the intellectual side, the contrast he suggests with the poems, and with the sermons of Andrewes and Taylor, his clear description of the qualities of their style, their rhetorical devices, their analogies, their subtleties and eccentricities, not least

their melancholy, go to form by far the best criticism they have yet received. And Mr. Stephen does not altogether shut his eyes to their deeper merits, though he dwells with more zest upon their defects. He allows Donne "depth of feeling;" he admits that occasional passages "glow with genuine fire." But though he refers to the famous peroration of the seventy-sixth sermon, he does not recognize that the amazing force of that passage does not lie in its rhetoric, or even in its emotion, but in the imaginative intensity with which it realizes the being of God. This, in a word, is the secret of Donne's effect. A preacher with a faith in God that is hardly removed from sight cannot fail of conveying his belief to his audience; even though the matter in hand be dry and metaphysical, an emphasis, a parenthesis, which in print attract no attention, may in speaking have had the effect of a revelation; for a fire that is always smouldering will sooner or later break out. That seems to be the secret of the "tears" and "raptures" that were at the command of the crabbed Donne, and were not at the command of the rich eloquence and graceful fancy of Jeremy Taylor.

APOLOGIA PRO CLERO

I

APOLOGIA PRO CLERO.

I.

WE have lately been informed in many quarters, so that the remark is becoming a commonplace in the daily and weekly newspapers, that the clergy of this generation, in their pursuit of novelty, have broken away from the severe and sensible religion of their forefathers in the venerable Church of England. Hence, it is said, matters are approaching a serious crisis. The road taken by the great bulk of the clergy is more and more diverging from the narrow way in which the laity have always walked and mean to walk, and soon the two parties will be out of eyeshot and earshot. Against such a contention it is of no avail to point to the fact that there is a House of Laymen which sits periodically along with Convocation, because it is a recognized fact that this House is not sufficiently representative. Equally idle is it to point out that the English Church Union, the society supposed to be heading the migration into the desert of newfangledness, is presided over by a layman, and numbers among its members far

more laity than clergy; because it is replied that the clerical layman is a genus by himself, and a worse enemy to true religion than the most clerical of the clergy. So that the indictment has to be amended into a charge not against the clergy but the clericals. Let me begin by saying that I frankly agree with the plaintiff, whom for convenience I will call the layman, that even in a democracy truth cannot be ascertained by counting heads. I cheerfully admit that because the numbers of a society are increasing by leaps and bounds, as we are assured is happening to the English Church Union, it is not thereby proved to be in possession of the whole truth. But if I do this, I must ask him to make me the same admission. I must claim that the opinions of the irreligious and merely careless, which are always proffered against the Church on a favourable opportunity, shall not be allowed in evidence, and that the contempt of the rabble shall not be held to prove that the clergy are contemptible. There is a beatitude on those who are persecuted for righteousness' sake which seems to imply that persecution is not an improbable event; and such persecution may be carried on by the innuendoes of peers of the realm as well as by the less polished ribaldry of the British workman in a third-class smoking-carriage.

The fundamental difference of view between the two parties will perhaps be best appreciated with reference to the subject of worship; about which,

indeed, most of the public controversy arises. With the one party worship is an end in itself, with the other only a means to an end. The one looks upon the worship of God as the highest duty of the creature; the other regards "church-going" only in its reflex influence upon the character of the "church-goer." Hence, while the one side is inclined to multiply services, and to employ upon them the highest faculties of human nature, in music and painting and arts allied to these, the other is apt to regulate its acts of devotion by the mental and moral stimulus it feels necessary for the system at the moment, and to prefer the directly receptive method of preaching to the more roundabout method of prayer. I do not think such a difference in men's attitude towards worship is misstated. It is no doubt true that there are High Churchmen still who, like some of the early Tractarians, prefer that worship shall be simple; and there are as certainly Broad Churchmen who have a taste for the fine arts, and, now that the battle has been won, make their buildings and services as splendid as they can. But the cathedrals of which we are so justly proud, and the painted windows that were once an additional glory to them, and the music that was written to be sung there, were all in their origin inspired by the theory that worship was due from man to God, and should be as magnificent as man could make it; and the revival of this magnificence followed very closely on

the revival of the idea of worship. But when the case is stated so, I do not see how an unprejudiced judge could avoid deciding that the clerical point of view is the only defensible one as long as the Church of England holds by its creeds. Granted that the facts of the creed are as they are stated, and in this controversy they are not supposed to be in dispute, for our aggrieved layman is a member of the Church of England, then there is ample warrant for this clerical insistence upon worship for its own sake, as "very meet, right, and our bounden duty."

But it is just this necessary content of his Churchmanship that the layman too often ignores. Since he reached manhood he has never been asked to subscribe to any creed, and he remembers very vaguely what was promised for him in his baptism. He reckons himself a Churchman chiefly because he more or less frequently goes to church, and does not go to conventicles. But probably, if pressed to define his position more exactly, he would say he was a Churchman without dogmas. Now, it is worth while to look such a position as this fairly in the face, and see its meaninglessness. There can be no religion without dogmas. The existence of God is a dogma quite as much as the Incarnation. Certain philosophies have, it is true, laid down the necessity of a spiritual principle to explain the universe we know; but the idea of God as a God of love and righteousness, which is after all what the layman means by

God, comes to him not from philosophy but through the Christian revelation. If he accepts this notion of a Creator on the authority of Scripture, confirmed by such evidence as he himself may have been impressed by, in the course of history, or the beauty of nature, or the happiness that right conduct brings, he has given in his assent to the first article of the Christian creed, and is to that extent a dogmatist; for what has convinced him falls very far short of proof. He will then have to settle with his conscience how far he can accept such an all-important statement as this concerning the Divine nature, upon the authority of Christ, and leave aside others as being inconceivable. The layman sometimes occupies the position of one who accepts all the teaching of Christ that concerns our duty to each other, based as this is upon His revelation of the character of God, while neglecting all Christ's teaching about Himself; or again, of one who accepts the doctrine of immortality for the race without accepting the fact of the resurrection of Christ, which first brought it home to men's hearts, and is indeed our sole evidence accredited by witnesses for any resurrection at all. The crucial point then to determine, the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*, for men now, as it was for the apostles, and as it has been in all ages of the Church, is the possibility of worshipping Christ. It was St. Peter's declaration of our Lord's Messiahship at Cæsarea Philippi that was hailed by Him as the

foundation-stone of the Church; and all the endless controversies since have in reality turned on the same point. Humorists, for example, have been pleasant over the fact that a vowel, as between the Homoousiasts and Homoiousiasts, could rend the Church into parties, but the vowel meant worship or no worship; since to worship anything lower than God is idolatry. Undogmatic Christianity, therefore, is a meaningless phrase; and the test of Christianity is worship; so that the clergy are amply justified in laying upon worship all the stress they do.

But when that is allowed, it is far from settling the whole question in favour of the clericals. We read with horror of all the desecration that befell our churches under the unscrupulous and sacrilegious orders of King Edward the Sixth's lay counsellors; we shudder at the narrow escape of Westminster Abbey; but if we are candid we must admit that if the worship that had gone on in these churches had been all that it ought to have been, the spoilers would have found no help and little mercy among the worshippers. As we know, what was largely lacking in the pre-Reformation worship was the element of the intelligence. The creed was supposed to be symbolized by the ritual; but the symbolism was not explained; preaching was perfunctory and ignorant; and the doctrines that were most zealously taught were not articles of the Catholic faith at all,

but accretions which had accumulated in times of ignorance, and which therefore the new scholarship that came in with the study of Greek was bound to expose. One great danger, then, that the layman feels, even when he has accepted as paramount the idea of worship, is the possibility, nay, the certainty, that worship will degenerate and become superstitious, unless it can take up into itself the intellect as well as the emotions. And the layman roundly asserts that among the clericals some are obscurantist, and too few supply in their churches such preaching as can uplift the mind of the educated Englishman and help to clear away the difficulties that beset his faith. Speaking broadly, and not forgetting conspicuous exceptions, I should be tempted to say he is right. There has been too much tendency among the rank and file of the High Church clergy to think and speak of preaching as a "Protestant" and not a "Catholic" ordinance. Such a view was very natural as a reaction from the view current earlier in the century, which elevated the sermon into the sole means of obtaining Divine grace. The Puritan has always had a very insufficient idea of the meaning and duty of worship, and an exaggerated idea of the advantage likely to accrue from hearing sermons. But though one extreme may account for another, it does not justify it. If some of my younger brethren are tempted to think that preaching came in with the Reformation, and may therefore be esteemed

lightly, I would ask them to pay a visit to such churches as Burford or Oundle, where the pulpits date from the fifteenth century; and if they still hesitate to admit its true catholicity, I would advise a course of St. Augustine's or St. Chrysostom's homilies. But even supposing it were a Protestant innovation, it is at present enjoined by rubric and cannot be avoided; and if that is so, and if men will be drawn to hear if the preacher gives them of his best, it is worse than idle to abuse the opportunity, as is sometimes done. The cleric says, "Come to church and worship"; the layman replies, "Well, at any rate I will come and hear what you have to say. I quite recognize that six days' preoccupation with finance may tend to materialize my view of things; besides, there are not a few moral questions that I should like to hear straightened out. 'Be fructuous,' then, 'and that in little space.'" If the layman thus replied to St. Paul, could one imagine that great ecclesiastic replying, "Oh, I am a priest, not a preacher; my business is to christen and confess you, and so forth; if you want preaching, there is plenty, I believe, at the meeting-house opposite"? I should like to ask my brethren the plain question, Can the laity be blamed for requiring that at least as much pains should be spent upon preaching in the English Church as is spent among the dissenters? Surely they are justified in their demand. Why, because we think preaching of less importance than

worship, should we preach as badly as we do? And it is really not of less importance. Worship, apart from the instruction of the mind and conscience, must be partial and tend to be perfunctory. It is characteristic of George Herbert, whom we all unite to honour as a typical English Churchman, that in the church he restored at Leighton Ecclesia he ordered the reading-pew and pulpit to be of an equal height, "for he would often say, 'They should neither have a precedency or priority of the other; but that Prayer and Preaching, being equally useful, might agree like brethren, and have an equal honour and estimation.'"[1]

But our layman's case against the present conduct of public worship is not limited to the sermon. He will tell you that, accepting the principle of worship, he nevertheless hates grovelling, which is un-English and undignified, and that he thinks the Ritualistic vestments ridiculous. Here there is, perhaps, something to be said for him. The cleric will say: "I have come, as I sincerely believe, into the nearer presence of my Maker and Redeemer; no recognized posture of humility could under those circumstances be degrading to me, even though I am, as you say, an Englishman. I read that the saints in Scripture fell on their face when they realized God's presence; why should you expect me to do less?" To which I can conceive the layman replying:

[1] Walton's *Life of Herbert.*

"Moses put off his shoes at the bush, and Orientals still do so when they enter their churches; we do not. With us the accustomed attitude of humility is kneeling, and this is the posture prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. I do not see why you should go beyond it." In his reference to rubrical prescription the layman certainly scores his point; in the conduct of public worship no private motions are in place; at the same time it is hard to understand the layman's horror at more profound obeisances. Again, the layman is plainly within his right in objecting to the too mechanical ritual drill that vexes the heart in some churches. It is hard to conceive of the *ceremoniarius* as figuring among St. Paul's list of spiritual officers. It is quite true that there is a right and a wrong way of doing everything, and that there is a prescription of antiquity as well as of rubric; but what angers the layman (and in many of us clergy also the layman is not completely obliterated) is the too dapper performance of ceremonies, without dignity and without reverence, as though the ceremony were a feat of skill, and the officiating clergy members of a revived college of Salii performing round the Ara Maxuma. The objection to vestments, though perhaps equally characteristic of the modern Englishman, is not so successful in giving reasons for itself. The layman sometimes speaks about Ritualists as though they got themselves up at the theatrical costumier's in whatever gaudy trappings

pleased their vagrant fancy. He might with equal justice and equal success make fun of his Majesty's judges. It seems to me conduct on no higher level than that of street Arabs to take exception to the historical dress of a profession, every part of which has a history of centuries, on the ground that abstractly it is ridiculous. Abstractly, what dress is not ridiculous? The question of clerical vestments can only be fairly argued historically, in reference to the rubric which prescribes such as were in use in the second year of Edward VI.

Our layman, however, is careful to point out to us that it is not only the "advanced" clergy who cause him to stumble in his worship; even their very "moderate" brethren can give him scandal, and perhaps by nothing so frequently as the professional voice in which they think it right to read the prayers. *Nec vox hominem sonat* would sum up the criticism one most often hears. It is unmanly and affected. I am told that one of the most successful features in an entertainment at a fashionable watering-place this summer was an imitation of a curate giving out the Notices in church. One is grateful to the mimic for avoiding profanity by confining his parody to the Notices. But why should we, as a profession, indulge in the luxury of a professional voice? There are other clerical tricks that must be equally amazing to the angels. I heard a young man, only last month, read Evensong as though it were an exercise in the

importance of the preposition *of*. Each *of* was emphasized, and in the "Prayer for all conditions of men" he was in an ecstasy, they came so thick and fast. It will be said these things are trifles; but they are not. Nothing that hinders worship is a trifle; and everything that makes the clergy ridiculous hinders the cause of the religion of which they are the professed advocates.

Clerical affectation, however, is regarded by the layman as only one form of clerical arrogance; and so we come to the gravest charge of all against the profession—its growing sacerdotalism. One might accumulate a good deal of evidence to justify the layman's fears. I will relate here a single incident to show the sort of needless and foolish offence that is often given. I was in a church at Brighton with a lay friend, an artist, who wished to inspect the reredos, a painting by Burne-Jones. We made application to the sister in charge, who explained that no layman could be allowed in the chancel. We pleaded the special circumstances, but she was inexorable; so I, who had no strong interest that way, was allowed to pass within the screen and view so much of the picture as was visible between the serried files of wax tapers; but my friend was forced to be content with a view of the brass lectern, which the good sister, to remove any feelings of jealousy, kindheartedly uncovered for him. Now, if this does not mean that the clergy (including the men and boys of

the choir who may be understood to have received the minor order of exorcists) are holier than the laity, what does it mean? A choir separate from the nave in an abbey church for the special use of the religious, who by their vows are separate from the world, is intelligible; but in a parish church the separation cannot amount to more than a practical convenience, and to insist upon it is merely silly. It is far from uncommon, however. Only the other day, in Boston Church, I found a cord fastened across the entrance to the choir warning back the *profanum vulgus*, although the most interesting objects in the church are the misereres of the choir-stalls. Happily, the damsel in charge here had some common sense, and did not insist on dividing up our party. I do not believe the clergy who shut up their chancels in this manner do it after reflection; is it too much to ask that they shall weigh carefully what such a veil of partition really implies?

For it is absurd attempts, like these, at misunderstood and purposeless mediævalism which give the impression, shared at this time by many of the laity, of our growing professional arrogance. I believe the idea is a mistake. I believe that no profession is really less professional or more eager to be of use in the community. The sacerdotalism which the clergy would admit comes to no more than this: that they are ordained to a special office in the Christian Church, and that they believe they have

received Divine grace to enable them rightly to minister in it. As no layman ever wishes to deny that the clergy were solemnly set apart, with the prayers of the whole community, in order to perform special functions, those who deny them any special gift corresponding to their function ought, if they are consistent, to deny that any Higher Power ever intervenes in any act of religion. If the act of Ordination is simply the act of the presiding Minister, so is the act of Marriage; so is the act of Baptism. If in the case of Ordination the prayer for special blessing is not answered, neither is it answered in the case of the other solemn dedications, nor again is there any answer when the layman prays alone in his chamber. In short, prayer must be one of two things: either a means of receiving God's grace when the prayer is according to His will; or else, a sort of exercise for our emotional system; and what it is in one case it must be in all. The protest, therefore, against sacerdotalism so explained—and this is the only sacerdotalism known, in theory, to the English Church—comes with an ill grace from English Churchmen, who, in supporting the cry, are helping to do the work of the sceptic and the Romanist. A Church clergyman, when the question is raised as to the validity of Dissenting orders, must needs say that he believes the episcopal constitution of his own Church to be in harmony with the will of God, as expressed in the Bible, and that therefore he

is justified in believing in his own orders; but if he is wise and candid he will add that to pronounce upon others is outside the scope of his commission.[1] No doubt he will have an opinion, and a strong one, as to the intention of Christ to found a single visible Church, "a city set upon a hill;" an opinion also as

[1] I take the opportunity afforded by the reprinting of this paper to quote two passages upon this subject from the *Ordination Addresses* of the late Bishop Stubbs of Oxford (Longmans, 1901), who held with the firm faith of a trained historian that the Church of England inherited the apostolical commission: "The loyal Churchman does not brand as sinful schism the sects or the members of the sects that, following the authorities by which they have been led into the religion they love, are really showing a loyalty that is like his own, a loyalty that may deserve to be led right. He will not multiply or retaliate charges of heterodoxy or heresy. But neither will he derogate from the honour of the ideal and fact of his love by pretending to regard such differences as have caused discussion, as being unimportant in themselves and in their bearings. The sovereignty of truth may tolerate but will not condone error; the loyalty of the man of faith may endure but will not acquiesce in contradictions. And he who loves his Church will not cast in his lot with those who hate, or at all events say that they hate her. . . . The loyalty of the Churchman is well accustomed to be called bigotry, because he will not condescend to treat the things that are inseparably bound up with his spiritual life as matters to be lightly accounted of, in comparison with the professions of religious equality, or quasi-religious co-operation and unity. But he knows that the securing and defining of unity is a part of the work and purpose of God, that his own work is to hold fast the truth that God has granted him to see, and to do the duty that God has honoured him by allotting him" (p. 115).

Again, "We do not assume to limit God's gifts, we do not claim to exclude those who have not the privilege that we believe ourselves to have; but we do not, because they have it not, declare that we do not care about it, or do not believe in it. The clergyman of the Church of England has in his apostolic commission a record and character which, although it may be no sin in the outsider to deny, it is a sin in him to ignore" (p. 70).

to the havoc wrought in the mission field, at home and abroad, by the divisions of Christendom; he will probably entertain little respect for the current apology made for division, that it is a sign of growth; an apology borrowed from Milton's eloquent parody of the Parable of the Vine and its branches; but he will not imitate Roman arrogance by "unchurching" any community of Christians. Even Newman, in the militant mood in which he put together the *Lyra Apostolica,* writing upon schism, forbade railing at dissenters, and insisted that

> "Christ's love o'erflows the bounds His prophets trace
> In His revealed design."

But our layman has not yet emptied his quiver. By sacerdotalism, he will tell us, he does not mean merely a belief that the clergy are the organs of the Christian society for specific purposes; he means, further, the belief that those specific purposes are miraculous and supernatural. In particular, he is inclined to object to any view of the Lord's Supper which raises it above the level of a Commemorative or Guild Feast, and he is certainly convinced that an attempt is being made in England to go behind the Reformation and reintroduce teaching which was at that time deliberately rejected. If he is told that English doctrine about the "real presence"—as stated, *e.g.* by Dr. Pusey—differs entirely from Roman doctrine by the fact that it denies any substantial change in the elements, he will reply that the Marian

martyrs did not give their lives for a subtle distinction; and he will point to the growing use of the word "Mass" as an index that the distinction is meant to be of the slightest, and point further to the constant, if slow, stream of clergy who pass over from a section of our own Church to the Church of Rome. With the layman, on this point, it is difficult not to feel very strong sympathy. I, for one, should go with him a long way. I should agree that a small, and possibly a growing, party among both clergy and laity have entirely lost respect for the Protestant character of our Reformed Church; that Roman ways and Roman dress were being imitated for no other reason than that they are Roman, and that the self-sacrifice of our once revered Marian bishops was held by them as a vain expense, if not as a deserved punishment for heresy. I should agree with him that it is a lamentable fact that men who have seen with their own eyes in foreign countries the disastrous effects upon religion and morality which a mechanical system tends to induce, should allow themselves to be hypnotized by some phrase into making that system their own. There is no more astonishing instance than the famous one of John Henry Newman. To read his letters from abroad and then to read the story of his conversion is to wonder whether there is such a thing in the world as a matter of fact. But the journey once made, with whatever difficulty and labour, by a great

leader, his followers with no difficulty at all, but merely following the lead of his great name, when they reach a certain pitch of excitement, "pave after him a broad and beaten way."

But, while allowing that, we must beseech our lay friend not to imagine that all distinctions are idle because, to those who are not experts, they appear to be subtle; and also to take the pains to be quite clear what the points were to which our martyrs sealed their testimony with their life.

The articles that Cranmer and Latimer and Ridley were called upon to sign asserted that "in the Sacrament of the Altar there was really the true and natural body of Christ present which was conceived of the Virgin Mary, and that, after consecration, no substance remained either of bread or wine; and also that in the Mass was the life-giving sacrifice of the Church, which is propitiatory for the sins of quick and dead." That is to say, they were required to subscribe to the mediæval doctrines of Transubstantiation and Purgatory; and, whatever may have been the exact opinions at last held by these reformers—and they varied from themselves at different times—it was for refusing these Roman doctrines that they suffered. It would not be unfair to say that, in regard to the presence in the Eucharist, which they preferred to speak of as "spiritual," they rejected a miraculous, but upheld a supernatural, presence; and any *catena* of opinions from English

theologians would, on the whole, support this distinction. Let me give a short passage from Cranmer's *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament*, written in 1550, not as being an authoritative treatise, but as showing in what estimation that zealous reformer held the Christian feast. "Although He sit in heaven, at His Father's right hand, yet should we come to this mystical bread and wine with faith, reverence, purity, and fear, as we would do if we should come to see and receive Christ Himself sensibly present. For unto the faithful, *Christ is at His own table present with His mighty spirit and grace*, and is of them more fruitfully received than if corporally they should receive Him bodily present. And therefore they that shall worthily come to this God's board, must after due trial of themselves consider, first, who ordained this table, also what meat and drink they shall have that come thereto, and how they ought to behave themselves thereat. He that prepared the table is Christ Himself. The meat and drink wherewith He feedeth them that come thereto as they ought to do, is His own flesh and blood."[1] The difference, therefore, between the Roman and the English view would not to an agnostic seem worth the price of blood; but looked at by Churchmen with a regard to the effect upon worship, there is an essential difference, which shows itself by certain results in the two communions. In the English

[1] Quoted from Dr. Mason's *Life of Cranmer*, p. 131.

doctrine, the point insisted upon is that Christ is certainly present, according to His promise; the mode is not defined; and the imagination is left free to picture Him as it can best: probably in the imagination of many Churchmen no picture is so often present as that feast at Emmaus, when He Himself was seen to take bread and bless and break. In the other case the mind must be fixed simply upon certain particles of matter, and though faith may repeat to itself that the matter is not matter, yet of such a question the senses remain imperious judges, and in the last resort the only credible witnesses; and though faith may be very valiant and still assert that the wafer is changed into the substance of Christ's body, yet the imagination finds it impossible to relate this to His person. Adoration, therefore, remains the adoration of matter not of spirit, at best of a body not of a character; and so it becomes inevitably, if not idolatrous, yet of the nature of a magical rite, which has no necessarily uplifting effect upon the soul. It has no correspondence to the worship we should pay to Christ if He were again to walk in our streets. The anxiety therefore displayed by our untheological layman at the revival of the word "mass" for the service of Holy Communion, does not seem misplaced; for such a revival is an obvious sign of sympathy with Roman doctrine. The wonder is that the word has so long been tolerated by those in authority, for it was dropped in the second

Prayer-book, and not restored in any later revision. Speaking for myself, I would far rather allow incense and processional lights, which are ancient and harmless customs, and susceptible of mystical interpretation, than I would allow the word "mass" to be used in a church belonging to the Church of England; for the meaning of a word is not its etymological meaning, but the sense it has come to bear by use.[1]

If the layman, not content with the banishment of the *miraculous*, still protests against any *supernatural* element being allowed to cling to the Eucharist, is he quite clear where this protest will lead him? Will it not compel him to believe that the Sacrament was originally instituted, not for the sake of feeding the flock, but merely to keep alive a fading memory as long as possible in a world where all things come to an end? In that case he must banish the supernatural element from religion altogether. And then, what is left? It would be some guide to the clergy if those laymen who are at the present moment most active in protest and invective, like Lord Portsmouth, would formulate for us the creed which they themselves hold; or if that is an impertinent question then the creed they wish to see held in the National

[1] Bishop Cosin tell us that the word, though in itself ancient and harmless, was deliberately cut out of the English Prayer-book because it had acquired a secondary and Roman sense, and while it was allowed to remain in Edward VI.'s first book, was interpreted in this depraved sense by papistically minded people: "ob hanc causam ab Ecclesia Anglicana *ipsum etiam vocabulum rejicitur*" (*Works*, V. 301).

Church. We should then know better how far it would chime with our present creed and articles. It may be that what they require in the clergy is simply a force of black dragoons to help keep order in the State by policing the populous districts and preaching respect for property. I saw lately two very suggestive allegories of such a reformed Church of England. One was at the seaside. The sea on that part of the coast was encroaching, and it had already washed away the nave and chancel of the church. But the local board, not liking to lose so venerable a monument as the ivy-clad tower, and thinking it might, if looked to, do service as a breakwater, built it into the sea-wall, where it was found both useful and picturesque. The other was a market cross in Northamptonshire. The cross, indeed, was gone from the top of the shaft, but that remained, and by a little ingenious ironwork had been converted into both a lamp and a sign-post.

APOLOGIA PRO CLERO

II

APOLOGIA PRO CLERO.

II.

In the paper to which this is an annex, I made an attempt to collect the various charges that from time to time I had heard alleged against the clerical order, to examine what element of truth they contained, and to offer what defence seemed possible for myself and my brethren. My present object is to touch upon some parts of the clerical ideal, which were not there referred to, and to suggest that, with all our shortcomings, we of the English clergy have been remarkably true to our best national traditions, and have indeed, under superficial differences, preserved a type that was vigorous before the Norman Conquest, and is vigorous to-day. For the persistence of type I do not claim credit to ourselves; it may be due to a certain stiffness of original clay in our English constitution. But I do wish to lay stress upon it, because at the moment it is being lost sight of, and attention is being directed instead to another trait, more superficial and apparently antagonistic, of which I will speak presently.

1. It must have struck every one who has read

Chaucer's beautiful description of the parson in the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales*, that the picture in its essential lines might have been drawn from not a few parsons known to ourselves. The learning, the generosity, the activity in visiting, the patience in teaching, the general fatherliness with capacity for sharp rebuke upon occasion, are all characteristics as familiar to us as to Chaucer. And they are discoverable in every age, especially when some calamity befalls that brings the simple parish priest into the light of history. Such was Rowland Taylor, whose biography we owe, with that of not a few others, to the pen of the Martyrologist Fox, who, with all his partisan credulity, was a good judge of character; such was "the apostle of the north," Bernard Gilpin; such was George Herbert during his few years at Bemerton; such were Samuel Wesley of Epworth, and Fletcher of Madeley. These are conspicuous examples in the memory of every one, but they are no more than specimens of their class.

And not only is the parochial ideal of duty a constant, or at least a perpetually recurring one, but we find from the earliest times evidence of characteristic preferences in the wider field of Church politics. One such constant characteristic is a strong apathy, becoming at intervals a strong antipathy, towards the Roman see, and a correspondingly strong sense of the necessary attachment between the English Church and State. In Saxon times the bishops

and clergy had rank and duties in the body politic, independently of a place in their own ecclesiastical synods. All through mediæval times bishops were great officers of State; and even now the ordinary Englishman is pleased that they should have a seat in the Upper House of Parliament. As to the early existence of anti-papal feeling, Dr. Cutts [1] points out that the canons sent by Boniface to Cuthbert, and considered by the Council of Clovesho (A.D. 747), were all passed, with the exception of the two preliminary canons formally acknowledging the supremacy of Rome. "The omissions," he adds, "are the most important part of the document." The anti-papal acts of the parliaments of Edward I., following upon the papal extortions under John and Henry III., are numerous; and those in Henry VIII.'s reign, although dictated by the King, were far from being unpopular. Another characteristic that we meet in Saxon days, and constantly afterwards, is a sense of the importance of reading the Scriptures and preaching, and the reasonableness of saying divine service, if not in the mother tongue, yet so as it might be heard and followed by the congregation. Translations of Holy Scripture into English go back as far as King Alfred and the Venerable Bede. By canons of the synod of Clovesho already referred to, priests are instructed to be careful about explaining to their people the meaning of the Sacraments and the symbols used; to translate

[1] *Parish Priests and their People in the Middle Ages* (S.P.C.K.), p. 61.

the words used in the prayers, and teach the Creed and Our Father; and to use simple plain-song for the service, or else read it distinctly. This insistence upon worshipping with the understanding as well as with the spirit has been first and last a typical trait of the English Church, and as characteristic of the clergy as of the laity. A third noticeable feature in English Churchmanship from the earliest days is an aversion to discipline. The English have always retained a barbarian love of freedom and a hatred of being regulated, which people who have borne for a longer period the yoke of Roman law do not manifest. The Norman dominion, which for so long held the nation in a frame of iron, was no doubt good for us in the main; but even that did not succeed in taming the wild English spirit. There are two institutions familiar in continental Churchmanship which were never deeply rooted in English soil, because they interfered too greatly with individual liberty. The first was clerical celibacy; the second, monasticism. Of the first I need not speak, because the feeling against it is as strong now in England as ever it was.[1] Monasticism stands on a somewhat different footing. The monasticism that Englishmen thoroughly understood was the missionary centre for

[1] I heard it said the other day that there are two points in regard to the clergy upon which English laymen have made up their minds: first, that they shall be married men; and secondly, that they shall be paid as though they were celibate.

the evangelization of a district, or the college of like-minded men engaged in similar work. The Benedictine monastery for contemplation and devotion was foreign to their national *ethos*. In Wakeman's *History of the Church of England* there is an interesting passage about Harold's foundation of a college for secular canons at Waltham at the very moment when Edward the Confessor was founding his monastery of St. Peter at Westminster: "In ecclesiastical matters he was out of sympathy with a predominant thought of his time; though by no means irreligious, in his religious policy he was national even to the verge of being insular. When the best thought and noblest devotion of Christendom were embracing the monastic ideal, when Herlwin, and Lanfranc, and Anselm, and Wulfstan were monks, Harold ostentatiously set his face against monasticism, and in his own beloved foundation of Holy Cross at Waltham deliberately preferred a secular constitution" (p. 80).

National to the verge of being insular,—that is no unfair characterization of Englishmen; and perhaps it is no very shameful characterization of a church and polity, which are the church and polity of Englishmen. One feels sometimes that if a certain small section of the clergy could be content to be a little more insular; if, like their rude forefathers, they would look upon the association of Church with State as a national institution to be made the most of instead of derided; if they would consider the English love

of preaching as a characteristic to be appealed to for a good end; and if they would revive the life of missionary communities without wearing a habit and adopting disciplinary practices that revive all the English distaste for foreign monasticism—they would find the national and insular laity more sympathetic.

2. And that brings me to speak of the remarkable inconsistency, referred to above, which occasionally shows itself in English nature, I mean the susceptibility to foreign fashions. The trait is superficial, and is related to our superficial humility, but every now and then it gets the better of our common sense. One well-known occasion in Church history was the period immediately preceding and succeeding the Norman Conquest, when, under the inspiration first of St. Dunstan and afterwards of Lanfranc and Anselm, monasteries to the number of three hundred sprang up over England on the Benedictine model. The enthusiasm which reared those magnificent piles soon died down, because it was not an enthusiasm of which the practical English nature was for long capable; and although the monasteries became model landlords, and some of them renowned seats of learning, they showed by so becoming that in heart they were "secular" rather than "religious," using those words in their technical sense. Chaucer's monk is a good-humoured country gentleman, and his prioress the accomplished head of a girl's high school, both excellent people, but not excellent

after the type of Cluny. Hence no one can much blame Henry VIII. for determining upon the dissolution of the Houses, but only for appropriating and wasting the Church's money which they held in pious trust. A second remarkable instance of the Englishman's attraction to foreign fashions in religion was the passion for the Calvinistic form of Church doctrine and government that swept over England in the reign of Elizabeth. The English conservative tradition seemed to contract itself into the single person of the Queen, and a few philosophers like Hooker. By dint of browbeating the bishops, Elizabeth succeeded in maintaining episcopacy; but under a more susceptible monarch it is doubtful if that order would have survived the brief frenzy. Bancroft, in a book published in 1593 called *Dangerous Positions and Proceedings under Pretence of Reformation*, called attention to a widespread attempt to introduce the Calvinistic organization into England by the device of insisting upon a presbyterian call to pastorates, while allowing episcopal ordination as a purely civil rite.[1] Certain counties were actually divided up into presbyteries, the first being erected at Wandsworth in 1572. Not the least interesting of the stories preserved to us about this matter is that of the attempt made by Travers, the Reader at

[1] The best modern account of this Presbyterian plot will be found in the present Bishop of Oxford's Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*.

the Temple Church, to persuade Hooker, when he had been appointed Master by the Crown, not to preach until the congregation had sealed his appointment by a solemn call.[1] A third instance of this singular imitativeness, though on a much smaller scale, we have all witnessed during the past quarter of a century in the wholesale adoption of services, ceremonies, and ornaments from modern Rome. There is no need to go into particulars, and happily the epidemic shows signs of abating, for there has sprung up in recent years a school of ritualists, who, with more learning and greater patriotism, have pointed out to these Italianate clergy a more excellent way.

3. Such fashions, however, although violent while they last, have been only occasional and of short duration, and they have never been allowed to interfere with the deep-seated ideal of clerical duty. As elements in this ideal, it is interesting to note certain qualities which, under forms varying with the various constitutions of society, have consistently maintained themselves. To speak first of what to many has seemed a purely modern development, the interest taken of late years in the improvement of the social conditions under which the poorer classes live, whether in town or country. In regard to the towns, this is an endeavour to mitigate the new slavery that has

[1] There is an interesting parallel in the recent Puritan attempt to convert the ancient ceremony of Confirmation of bishops into a Court of Triers; the Crown in each case standing for freedom.

followed in the wake of the industrial revolution of last century ; in the villages it has been part of the millennial effort to persuade the yeomen that the labourers are their brethren in Christ. Those who are interested in maintaining brutalizing conditions of labour, because they are found to be profitable, naturally view with dislike any interference on the part of the Church ; on the other side, it has sometimes been held, even by Churchmen, that in attempting to deal with economic problems, the Church has gone beyond her province. It is useful, therefore, to look back to the Middle Ages and see how, at a time when an exact faith was not undervalued, the clergy found time and opportunity for interest in the secular life of their people, and made themselves felt as champions of righteousness and mercy in an age-long conflict with the tyranny of feudalism. Bishop Hobhouse, in a most valuable preface contributed to the fourth volume of the Somerset Record Society's publications, has drawn out clearly the share taken by the Church in alleviating the lot of the serfs on the manorial estates: "The religious conditions of the community stood in strong contrast to the civil. The spiritual authority was strong enough to control all orders and degrees of men in their mutual relations. The Church regulated the festal and work days. It claimed for the servile population to be free from the demands of service on the days set apart as Holy Days of obligation. These days were

not only the Lord's day and the great Christian feasts, but also days of local observance, *e.g.* the dedication day of the Parish Church, the day of the local Saint or of the principal guild-patron. On all these days the labourer, though born in serfdom, was free, only bound to the service of his Divine master. He donned his best clothes, he joined his fellow guildsmen, he marched under banners to the church as the common home of the highest and the lowest.

"After Divine service, there were amusements provided at the Church House, or on the village green. Somebody had given a tavern of ale [*i.e.* holy ale to be consumed] and invited the parishioners of the next parish; or there was a return revelry at the Church House of that parish, or the guild of Webbers and Hogglers was holding its 'ale,' or Robin Hood was mustering his men at the Butts, or the young men or the maidens were keeping Hockday. The bulk of the parishioners were, I conceive, engaged through their various associations in planning their amusements. They were not spectators or partakers merely, but also managers, sharing in the pageant and in the costs; and thereby the bonds of social fellowship were tightened, and the barrier lines between servile and free, which seem to the student of our law books to be so impassable, were melted away by the warmth of kindly fellowship. Certain it is that in these documents no trace is found of any class disfranchised by bondage from the even

enjoyment of the privileges, spiritual or social, which attached to the religious community.

"If we glance at a manor court-roll of the day, the condition of the civil community as there seen stands in strong contrast to the condition of the religious community (the very same persons be it remembered) as shown in the Church accounts. In the civil document the community is divided into sharply defined classes, the lord of the soil and his tenant, the tenants into bond and free, the villeins again subdivided according to the size of their holdings. The relative duties of class to class are sharply defined too, and are involuntary. They are all enforceable and enforced by fine and penalty. But in spite of this harsh look there are traces to be seen of a gradual blending of classes and interests, and of a continual softening of the earlier barrier lines. . . .

"The great blending force is, I conceive, to be found in the Church, *not only in its master precepts of brotherly love and mercy, but in the peculiar form which it adopted of social action, a form which its lofty authority then enabled it to carry out.* It was able to mitigate the rigour of the landlord's demands upon the servant of the soil, whom serfdom would else have doomed to an unceasing round of labour. It was strong enough to say to the master, 'Thy servant shall rest on the days that are marked as holy. Thou and thy servant together shall on those days resort to the house of your Divine Master, as fellow

servants, and there pay your united homage of prayer and praise.' It was in this way that the Holy Day of the Church became the holiday of the people."[1]

It is a significant comment on the Bishop's words that when, in the time of Edward VI., the Church lay prostrate under the feet of the English landlords, one of their first complaints was of the number of holidays still left after Henry's reduction, and one of their first legislative acts to reduce them still further. Plainly, then, in mediæval times it was part of the everyday business of the parish clergyman in the name of the Church *deponere superbos de sede et exaltare humiles*. The Church in each parish was a branch of the great Christian Social Union.

4. Another ideal of the modern parish clergyman, closely allied to his interest in economic questions, is an endeavour to organize charitable relief so as to diminish its pauperizing effects. This also has been objected to by many devout minds, as though it were an infringement of the Divine command, "Give to every one that asketh of thee." It is notorious that the Roman Church looks favourably upon the practice of giving alms to beggars, and some of those in our own communion who sympathize with Roman doctrine have been apt to resent the effort to raise almsgiving out of the region of mere impulse. But mediævalists least of all men have a right to do so. If they would

[1] See also two interesting essays by Dr. Jessopp on *Parish Life in England before the Great Pillage* (Fisher Unwin).

study the methods of their own mediæval forefathers, they would find that almsgiving in the Middle Ages was thoroughly and admirably organized. In those days there was no relief given by the State, and it is astonishing to discover that there were no alms collected in church. "The audit sheets," says Bishop Hobhouse, "do not show a single eleemosynary item." How, then, were the poor relieved? The answer is that almost everybody was a member of some gild; these gilds being established either amongst members of a particular trade or amongst residents at a particular place for a special religious purpose. The members subscribed to a common fund, from which payments were made for the special object of the association, whether to keep a bridge in repair, or to celebrate a pageant, or maintain a school; and while a portion of the annual income went to support the chaplain who said mass at a special altar, other portions, as in modern benefit clubs, were assigned to sick and burial funds, and to relieve the poorer members. It was usual for members, both rich and poor, to make bequests to these gild funds, so that there was money to draw upon in time of need; and this money was dispensed by officers who knew all the circumstances of those who might apply for help. Dr. Cutts, in the chapter on "Gilds," in his fascinating book to which I have already made reference, quotes from the rule of the Ludlow Gild: "If any of the brethren or sisters be brought to

such want that they have not enough to live upon, then once, twice, thrice, but not a fourth time, as much help shall be given them out of the goods of the gild, as the rectors and stewards, having regard to their deserts and to the means of the gild, shall order. . . . If any brother or sister be wrongfully cast into prison, the gild shall do its utmost, and spend money, to get him out. . . . If any fall into grievous sickness they shall be helped, both as to their bodily needs and other wants, out of the common fund of the gild, until their health is renewed as before. If any one becomes a leper, or blind, or maimed, or smitten with any incurable disorder (which God forbid), we will that the goods of the gild shall be largely bestowed on him. . . . If any good girl of the gild cannot have the means found her by her father, either to go into a religious house or to marry, whichever she wishes to do, friendly and right help shall be given her out of our means, and our common chest, towards enabling her to do whichever of the two she wishes" (p. 474).

No doubt there was room, outside the work of the gilds, for benevolence on the part of landlords and masters, and Chaucer implies that his country parson, poor as he was, found opportunities for almsgiving—

> "Full loth were he to cursen for his tithes,
> But rather would he given, out of doubte,
> Unto his poore parishens about
> Of his offering, and eke of his substance.
> He coud in litel thing have suffisance."

Still, the main business of relieving the poor fell to the gilds, and it was conducted on business-like principles, and with a view, as we can see from the Ludlow rule, to the spiritual benefit of those who were relieved. All this excellent work came to an end in 1545, when the Defender of the Faith, having absorbed the monasteries, seized upon the property of the gilds, on the plea that they countenanced prayers for the dead, and with Edward VI. begins the reign of the poor law. It is possible, then, by English precedent of many centuries standing, to justify those clergymen who plead that an interest in economic questions is right and necessary for parish priests.

5. But though this economic interest is a very conspicuous element in our modern parochial ideal, no Churchman would allow it to claim the highest place. We cannot agree with a popular essayist that while we have to make ourselves *good*, our duty to our neighbour is limited to making him *happy*. In general terms there would be no difference of opinion among Churchmen as to the highest duty of the clerical office; and it might be stated now, with certainty of general acquiescence, in the terms employed by any Church Synod since the Church of England was founded. A priest's duty is defined, for example, in the canons of Edgar, as (1) devoutly to serve and minister to God and intercede for all Christian folk, and (2) to be ready to help others

both Godward and manward. Of so much of the first branch of the ideal as relates to worship I have spoken already in the first part of this apology, and I need not repeat what is there said; of intercession I will say a word by-and-by. In regard to the second branch, it is plain that social work comes under its second division, the helping of others *manward;* and there remains the first division, or helping men Godward, which, again, is usually divided into the two ministries of the Word and the Sacraments. In regard to the latter of these ministries, although the significance of the Sacraments has been, and still is, variously interpreted by parties in the Church, there has never been any cessation in the ministry itself; but, in regard to the former, although the ideal has remained, practice has been curiously uncertain. During the Middle Ages, if preaching fell into neglect here and there, the fault lay with the individual priest or bishop. During the Reformation period, it too often lay with the sovereign, who, finding himself unable to tune the pulpits as he pleased, was apt to prohibit preaching altogether except by special licence, so that Bucer could speak of parishes which had not heard a sermon for six years. But the English ideal has never ceased to recognize preaching as an important part of clerical duty; and while successive canons all through the Middle Ages press it upon the clergy, we see, from some interesting returns to episcopal visitation articles, that the laity

were not inclined to go without their rights. These passages have been several times referred to of recent years, but perhaps they will bear quoting again; they are from Bishop Stapledon's Visitation of the diocese of Exeter in 1301.[1] Some of the parishes had no fault to find with their clergyman on this head, and say so: "Dicunt quod vicarius bene et honeste se habet et optime informat eos in spiritualibus. Dicunt quod bene instruit eos;" and these are the most numerous of the cases reported. The return from Colebrook says that Sir William preaches in his own way, and explains the gospel on Sunday as well as he can (*quatenus novit*), but does not give them much instruction on the Creed, or the Commandments, or how to avoid Deadly Sin. The same expression, *quatenus novit*, which must have been technical, is used by the parishioners of Colyton about their Sir Robert, but they add that they do not find his teaching sufficient. Moreover, they complain that he does not call in the friars, as his predecessors used, to give them instruction for the good of their souls.[2]

[1] Edited by Prebendary Hingeston-Randolph. See pp. 109, 130, 194, 337, 347, 378, etc. The points in clerical duty on which most stress is laid are preaching and prompt visitation of the sick ("festinanter visitat infirmos"). The parson of Colebrook is objected against for having his gate so far from the hall that a person calling outside is not heard, which is dangerous in cases of sickness (p. 109).

[2] "Dicunt quod Dominus Robertus Vicarius eorum probus homo est et predicat eis quatenus novit, set non sufficienter, ut eis videtur. Dicunt eciam quod predecessores ejus consueverunt vocare Fratres ad

This reference to the friars reminds us of one epoch in the history of our Church when the ministry of the Word rose to its full apostolic energy. And the extraordinary success of the friars may suggest to us how that ministry, if only it could to-day be embraced with kindred devotion, would repeat the miracle of the thirteenth century, and bring into the fold of the Church our vast populations, who are made of the same responsive flesh and blood as their forefathers. Can we see at all what would be the necessary conditions of such a success? Plainly there would need, now as then, to be two orders corresponding to the Dominicans and Franciscans, one of which should be trained for preaching to the educated, the other for preaching to the poor. It is very rarely that the same man has the double power. Neither Whitefield nor Wesley, whose achievement approaches nearest to that of the friars, had much success among the educated classes, because their methods were not such as to appeal to them. To speak, therefore, first about the possibility of a modern order of friars minor. Of devotion now as then there is no lack; of capable leaders there is no lack either, though no movement of the sort ever has been successful on a large scale without the one supreme leader of genius, capable of inspiring enthusiasm, and convinced that he has a mission to do

instruendum eos super salutem anime, set iste non curat de eis, et si a casu venerint, non recipit eos nec præbet eis viatica."

this one thing and this one thing only. But until he arrives, what paralyzes more ordinary effort is the lack of money to ensure to those who give themselves to the work the bare necessaries of life. The idyll of St. Francis and his bride, the Lady Poverty, is one that touches all our hearts, but poverty may mean many different things.

"The Lady Poverty was fair:
But she has lost her looks of late,
With change of time and change of air.
Ah, slattern, she neglects her hair,
Her gown, her shoes. She keeps no state
As once when her pure feet were bare.

"Or—almost worse, if worse can be—
She scolds in parlours; dusts and trims,
Watches and counts. Oh, is this she
Whom Francis met, whose step was free,
Who with Obedience carolled hymns,
In Umbria walked with Chastity?

"Where is her ladyhood? Not here,
Not among modern kinds of men;
But within starry fields, where clear
Through the thin trees the skies appear;
In delicate spare soil and fen,
And slender landscape and austere."[1]

In plain prose, an ideal needs translation into details of circumstance, and in this translation even St. Francis failed—failed even in his own age. It is admitted that what wrecked the friars was their custom of begging. To live on alms is a possible

[1] *Later Poems*, by Alice Meynell.

principle, but the line between that and mendicancy, though in principle they belong to different regions, is in practice of the finest, and is inevitably overstepped when the first enthusiasm of the laity cools. But the laity do not like beggars, and they are right; begging degrades character. When Chaucer begins his description of the friar by saying he was "the bestë beggar of his house," we know that the character to follow will not be flattering. Our modern order must not make this blunder; they must not beg. But how, then, shall we feed them? A pound a week each might suffice for men living in community, but that means fifty guineas in the year; for a hundred men to live in poverty we should require an income of five thousand pounds. How can we get it? I do not think we must look to millionaires. Money flows in a stream only through channels already made; and if our English millionaires would but emulate their Scotch compeers and help to re-endow the parochial clergy, of whose continued existence they are understood to approve, they would work a great work, and no one would look to them to make experiments. An order of poor brothers to evangelize the poor must depend in the first instance on the faithful alms of a few men who see the need.

Perhaps few of my lay readers are aware that an experiment on the lines indicated has been carried on now for a dozen years with results that are entirely

satisfactory so far as they go; only, unfortunately, from lack of funds, they go as yet so little way. At Mildenhall, in Suffolk, the Rev. Herbert Kelly presides over a school for Christian ministers, which is a model in little of what on a large scale the Church so greatly needs—that is to say, a home for the thorough training of selected candidates without private means for missionary work in our large centres of population. Mr. Kelly has lately printed a short tract setting out his system of education, and giving details of expense; and I would venture to commend it to the attentive reading of my brethren among the laity who have at heart the present horror of heathenism in England. When we recall how many of the great Churchmen of old days—including about a dozen Archbishops of Canterbury—were of humble birth, and owed their education in sacred studies to the generosity of patrons, we cannot avoid the reflection how little is done to-day to secure for the Church the talents and the vocation that must be lying unrecognized in hundreds of the youths who pass every year out of our elementary schools into occupations that make no call on their true capacities. I could wish the idea, so common with our forefathers, of helping poor "clerks," might again revive among us; as it is, when our gratitude to God is stirred and we seek some object for our generosity, our thoughts seem unable to rise higher than a subscription to an hospital. But when

the healing of the sick has become the care of the whole nation, Churchmen might well give their first thought to the healing of the soul. *Tu autem vade et annuntia regnum Dei.*

6. To pass on to the consideration of preaching on its more learned side—that is to say, the reconciliation of the claims of the Christian faith with those of the current criticism and philosophy—it is obvious to remark that this is work which the ordinary layman is apt to exact from his parish clergy, while the ordinary parochial clergyman, to do him justice, is generally willing to undertake it, *quatenus novit.* But a moment's reflection will show that the demand is unreasonable, and that the supply cannot, as a rule, be satisfactory. It is true that the Church of England has been accustomed to make its boast of a learned clergy, and except at certain unfortunate periods of her history, the boast has been justified—that is to say, the clergy have been trained in the liberal arts, and have been capable of interpreting the sacred writings by reference to the Vulgate, or later, to the Greek and (perhaps) Hebrew. Such learning, being specialized on the sacred writings, would enable them to instruct the laity in faith and morals; but since it could not be other than the current learning of the day, it could not suffice for the handling of new problems either in philosophy or criticism. The opposition always offered by the general body of the clergy to new theories has long been a byword of

reproach against them in the mouths of their enemies; but it is inevitable under the circumstances, being indeed paralleled in every profession, and it serves the same useful function in the region of theology as the veto of the House of Lords in politics; it prevents unconsidered innovations. But the Church, while not committing the defence of the Faith to the parochial clergy, should yet secure that the recognized results of criticism be made available for the laity, who have not time or training for following the intricate course of controversy in the learned treatises of theologians. We need a certain number of clergy who could be set free from parochial labour for the purpose of preaching to educated laymen on the defence of the Faith. When such sermons are announced in London, the congregations that crowd to hear show how widely the need is felt. But no London pulpits could be surrendered to apologetic preaching of this kind, because all have fixed congregations. This is so even at the Inns of Court chapels. And at our cathedral church and at Westminster Abbey, where the clergy are endowed, and so have leisure for study, the congregations are so mixed of all classes that the sermons cannot be technical. It would be well, therefore, if a certain number of Dominican brothers could be set apart to perambulate the country, giving at each centre the results of recent studies in a form capable of assimilation. The Community of the Resurrection

shows how a brotherhood with this object might be established among clergy who have enough private means for maintenance. And as the need for evangelists is still greater than that for apologists, we must make all our public effort at present for a Franciscan order and leave the Dominican order to private adventure.

7. Preaching does not, of course, exhaust the spiritual means by which the English parish priest seeks to build up the life of faith. He has in all ages shown a disposition to encourage his parishioners to unite in small societies, with some particular rule to observe or some pious practice to carry out in common. I have already made mention of the mediæval gilds and the good work they accomplished for the relief of their poor and sick members. But these gilds had also a distinctive devotion to a patron saint, at whose altar they worshipped, and usually some specific religious duty corresponding. Some of the greater gilds were instituted with a primarily religious intention, such as the Corpus Christi Gild at York, founded in honour of the Sacrament, and the Gild of the Lord's Prayer, whose members pledged themselves "to illustrate the scorn of vice and the praise of virtue, and to shun unworthy company and business." Such societies are useful as ministering to human infirmity of will, and they seem to have peculiar attraction for Englishmen ; for we find them springing up in most periods when there has been a deep and general

revival of religion. Under Elizabeth they took the form of meetings to read and discuss the Scriptures, "prophesyings" as they were called; and the Queen's ruthless suppression of these on the ground that they were seed-plots of Presbyterianism, as perhaps they were, offended the religious mind of England. There is a curious reference to this suppression in Spenser's *Shepherd's Kalendar*, where the fate of Archbishop Grindal, suspended by the Queen for his protest against her high-handed proceeding, is oddly enough compared to that of Æschylus, who was slain by an eagle dropping a shell-fish on his head. At the end of the seventeenth century, again, we find such meetings organized under the name of "religious societies." The prime mover in their foundation was Dr. Horneck, of the Savoy Chapel, and he was seconded by Dr. Beveridge, and that focus of enthusiasm, Dr. Bray, to whom the Church owes its flourishing Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge and for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. The following is Canon Overton's account of these religious gilds :—

"The societies were conducted most strictly on the lines of the Church's teaching. None were to be admitted as members except young men above sixteen years of age who had been confirmed. They were to choose a clergyman to direct them, and their meetings were to be strictly devotional. They were to use no prayers at their meetings except those of

the Church, and 'none that peculiarly belong to the minister, as the absolution.' The minister whom they chose was to 'direct what practical divinity was to be read.' After prayer and reading they were 'to have liberty to sing a psalm.' And after all this was done, if there was any time left, 'they might discourse with each other about their spiritual concerns,' but this was 'not to be a standing exercise which any should be obliged to attend unto.' After many other excellent practical rules, the last is, that they were 'to love one another, when reviled not to revile again, speak evil of no man, wrong no man, pray if possible seven times a day, keep close to the Church of England, etc.' They were to meet once a week, and at every meeting 'consider the wants of the poor, and each member was to bring a weekly contribution proportionate to his means.'"

By 1710 there were, says Canon Overton, no less than forty-five "religious societies" in London and Westminster, besides a great number in the various large towns in the kingdom. One great part of their effort was spent in increasing the number and devoutness of religious services; another in works of charity, such as founding schools, helping poor scholars at the university, setting free prisoners, etc. In both respects they present a close parallel to the mediæval gilds. It is obvious, therefore, to remark that the custom which has grown up in late years of establishing such religious societies with a rule of life is a

native English practice, and amply warranted by experience, as well as by the nature of the case. Gilds seem, indeed, an ordinance of nature for young men, because the influence of example, so potent at that time of life and so often used against religion, is thus enlisted in its service. One such society, which in America has flourished exceedingly, called the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, imposes upon each of the brotherhood the responsibility of enlisting one new member. It might be feared that our shyer English nature would recoil from such direct proselytizing were it not for the historical fact that the rapid growth of the Queen Anne societies was directly due to this very same rule.

8. There is one more element in the clerical ideal that must not be overlooked even in so brief a sketch as the present. It is one for which the layman should be specially grateful, but, as a matter of fact, it is that to which he most frequently fails to do justice; I mean, the practice of intercession. Our English rubric directs the parochial clergy to say the daily office in church unless hindered by reasonable cause; but the layman, who has his own business to attend to on the week-days, is sometimes apt to resent the parson's reading service in his absence. But the parson surely might reply in the words of Hamlet—

> "Every man hath business and desire
> Such as it is, and for mine own poor part,
> Look you, I'll go pray."

Prayer is in a special sense his business. He says the daily prayers in church rather than at home, in order that the "two or three" devout people who have leisure may join him; but he says them even though he is alone, pointing out to the layman, who is inclined to regard his own "assistance" as necessary for the validity of an act of intercession, that on similar reasoning he ought never to pray for absent friends.

No one comprehends the rationale of prayer, and for Christians it should be enough that they have the command and the example of Christ, and the practice of twenty centuries of Christendom. But in proportion as people come to understand themselves and each other, in that proportion their respect for prayer grows. We are coming more clearly to recognize the existence of innumerable subtle and spiritual links binding men together, and binding all men to God, and experience teaches that to dwell upon these mysterious bonds, to give them emphasis, is in some way to strengthen them. To bring before God our people's needs is, in some inscrutable way, to incline their hearts Godward. The great English poet of the Victorian era, although he held himself loose from the Church's dogmatic creed, was profoundly convinced of the reality of this chain of sympathy. In the *Morte d'Arthur*, he makes his dying king say—

> "For what are men better than sheep or goats
> That nourish a blind life within the brain,

If knowing God they lift not hands in prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friend?
For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

We may recollect, too, an interesting piece of experience recorded in General Gordon's diary: "Praying for people ahead of me whom I am about to visit gives me much strength; and it is wonderful how something seems already to have passed between us when I meet for the first time a chief for whom I have prayed." With these two testimonies from laymen of more than average sensitiveness to reality, I commend the subject to the consideration of my lay brethren. And I conclude this imperfect statement of our ideals with the thought it suggests, that perhaps a sufficient apology for the clerical order is the witness it bears before the world by such intercessions to the existence of a sphere of interests beyond those which are on every hand so obvious and engrossing.[1]

[1] Since writing the above I have read an essay by Mr. F. W. Head, Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, in *The Heart of the Empire*, written with too little regard for facts and logic, but with much of the enthusiasm and the ὕβρις πεπαιδευμένη proper to the junior members of a university, and so engaging to us who are growing old. The essay paints the Church as it is and as it might be. The blot upon the Church at present is that it does not attract the working classes, who are declared to be simple materialists, and the plausible advice is given to modify the ancient gospel into something that the materialist may find attractive. In the other section of the essay, however, it is laid down that the great function of the Church is to "witness to the unseen;" but it is not explained how this, its ancient function, is to be

combined with the new policy of attracting the materialist, or indeed with the new constitution proposed for it. The new Church is to have no creed but philanthropy. "The work which the hospitals are doing seems to be as sacred as that of district visitors" (p. 274). At any rate, it can hardly be said that hospitals "witness to the unseen." The membership of the new Church is to include the secularist and the agnostic (p. 290); for it is to be coextensive with the nation. In other words, it will "witness to the unseen" by vanishing. Every one must agree with the writer of this spirited essay that one way of compelling people to come into any society is so to enlarge its borders as to include them willy-nilly; but members so admitted are not likely to be among the most effective. It is, perhaps, worth saying plainly that so far as the Church is failing at present, it is for lack of sufficient staff, and not from any inherent vice in message or method. There are oases everywhere in the desert, and they are growing, and rapidly growing. In a church in Birmingham this February 1902, I saw a regular congregation of five hundred enrolled working men, the five years' harvest of one curate's work, not one of whom had been drawn by materialistic attractions. But the best reply to Mr. Head is furnished by an essay in the same volume by Mr. C. F. G. Masterman, who says plainly that the philanthropic Church, as represented by the secular settlement, has been tried and has failed, and that the future is with the old Church if workers can be found.

THE POVERTY OF THE CLERGY

THE POVERTY OF THE CLERGY.

THE story goes that once at the dinner-table of the late Master of Balliol, an eloquent dignitary of the Church was inveighing against the apathy of laymen in the matter of Church charities. "It is degrading that we should have to go round and beg hat in hand for what the charity of laymen should spontaneously supply." The social barometer had been falling degree after degree during the indictment, and when it was concluded, the small, piping, husky voice of the Master was heard to say: "Yes, what is degrading is, that the clergy should have to exaggerate." The whole company felt that the Master had saved the situation, if he had not indeed turned the tables. The dignitary was silenced, and the social barometer rose again. Then, having done his duty by his guests, the Master recollected that he also was a clergyman, and owed something to his cloth, and so continued: "I never exaggerate; but then I never get any money." Every one who has endeavoured

to raise money for charitable objects will sympathize with the eloquent dignitary of this authentic anecdote, and every one whose pockets have been attacked will sympathize with the Master's rejoinder. The fact remains that a very good cause may languish for want of support if it cannot be made to appeal vividly to the feelings through the imagination ; and that man is wise in his generation who knows how to enlist on the side of conscience such universally responsive emotions as those which the French politely named for us *amour propre* and *esprit de corps*. Jowett, it may be mentioned, did himself injustice when he disclaimed success as a collector of subscriptions ; it is true he did not exaggerate ; his method was to write begging letters to old members of his college with his own hand, a compliment that recognized the market value of an autograph, and was not without its reward.

Of the more important funds that were opened in 1897 as thankofferings for Queen Victoria's long and prosperous reign, that for the London hospitals was rendered auspicious by the Prince of Wales's inauguration, and that for the nurses by the Queen's own particular interest ; and apart from such loyal considerations, everybody felt and feels that nurses and hospitals are necessities of life, about the value of which there cannot be two opinions. But when our alms were solicited for the clergy, as they

were by the institution of the Queen Victoria Fund, the response was not so ready, as the published lists of subscriptions clearly show, although the Church in its corporate capacity recommended the fund to the charity of its children as its own peculiar thankoffering. What was the reason?

First of all—the fact may not be admitted, but it is true—the clergy, although they may be individually popular, are not now in England, and perhaps never have been, popular as a class. The popular uniforms are red or blue, hardly black. The touch of antinomianism that exists in everybody, parsons and all, Protestant and Catholic, is ever ready to rebel against an institution which exists to be a check upon our natural instincts. The feeling would not often obtain such vivid expression as in the Berkshire farmer's lament, "Us'll never be prosperous till us have fewer of they black parsons, and more o' they black pegs;" it would probably never be expressed at all in higher circles, unless in the smoking-room;[1] but the feeling is real enough to check the first impulse of the fingers towards the purse-strings.

[1] See, however, the essay already referred to (p. 179). "The problem [of clerical poverty] really seems to be that of a fair wage. The difficulty baldly stated is this—the clergy have one measure of their own value, the nation another. Demand and supply will always in the end correspond. If, therefore, the clergyman is not paid for, it means that his functions are not worth the price he puts upon them." When Cambridge fellowships drop in value owing to the same cause, viz. agricultural depression, does Mr. Head draw the same conclusion?

And then there comes in to reinforce this feeling another, also rarely expressed, and not easily expressible by the well-to-do, that poverty becomes the clergy. "Is there not a beatitude upon the poor —a beatitude to which the clergy are zealous in calling our attention? Is not the danger of riches one of the commonplaces of the pulpit? Well, then, let the clergy practise what they preach; an ounce of example is worth a pound of precept." It is always worth while to examine such general feelings as this, because in the last analysis they usually reveal some saving grain of truth. The contrast between the fishermen of Galilee, who, as Michael Angelo said to the Pope, "wore no gold on their garments," and their successors the bishops, whether of Rome or England, has been a text of satire since the dawn of modern literature. And no doubt from time to time the satire has been richly deserved. But satire can never be the last word on any subject, because it must, if it is to be pointed, omit a great many circumstances that a just estimation must take into account. For example, the argument from the apostles to an English clergy cannot be complete until it has weighed differences of climate, differences of work, differences of social organization. Whenever it has been found possible to revive again the life of Christ "after the flesh," as it was lived "beneath the Syrian blue," it has been in countries like Italy, where comparatively little food suffices

to support life, and where a natural shelter is all that is required for the greater part of the year; and further, it has been where the work to be done was of a missionary character, among a simple peasantry, and where mendicancy was an approved mode of subsistence.

In England, however, at least in country places, and with these alone I am here concerned, the work of the clergy is that of a settled pastorate; its circumstances have nothing idyllic about them; there can be little enthusiasm excited by their labours among the objects of them, and there is no disposition to support the clergy by free-will offerings. Those, then, who think it well, in the abstract, that a Christian clergy should be poor have to remember that this poverty must at least be construed as it is understood in England, and in the England of to-day, where "a living wage" has become a political term. There are, no doubt, at present many clergymen with private incomes; but by far the greater number of these have not an income large enough to dispense with a stipend: some £300 of private income, with as much from a benefice, will enable a man to bring up his family as he himself was brought up; without a stipend he could not do so. It might be possible, if the clergy were all celibate, to obtain year by year a certain number of men of birth and education, who would forego in the good cause the life they have been accustomed to, just as there are

always volunteers for the mission field. But Englishmen, especially English villagers, prefer a married clergy, and to offer them an artisan's wages is to ask men who have themselves enjoyed the education of gentlemen to be content to disclass their own children. This is what the sentimental preference for a poor clergy really comes to when put into words; and there is no person, whether simple or gentle, who would not shrink from it as a base piece of selfishness so soon as it is put into words for him.

But, again, I have heard it said—it was said by a clergyman of my acquaintance who has considerable private means, and the thought may be in the minds of others—"There seems a natural fitness that the clergy should suffer with their parishioners. The landowners and farmers are become, at least comparatively, poor men, and the clergy by operation of the same causes have become poor also. This will promote sympathy, and no doubt help rather than hinder their ministrations." There is a certain element of truth in this reflection. People are drawn together by common misfortunes. But the circumstances are not really alike in the two cases. The landlord and the farmer trade in the produce of the land and must expect to be subject to the ordinary rules of trade, among which are to be reckoned fluctuations of the market; but it is really an accident that the stipends of the clergy should depend

upon agriculture. The clergy, it is true, or their predecessors, reaped the advantage when prices were high, and so, it may be said, they have no right to grumble now that prices are low. As a rule, they do not grumble. But to say that the clergy have already experienced both advantages and disadvantages from their dependence upon land is not to justify that dependence. And there is a very practical difference between their position and that of the squires and farmers. These others can turn their hand to whatever at the time is the more profitable branch of their employment. Perhaps it is stock that for the moment commands a high price, perhaps dairy produce or fruit, but none of these things affect tithe rent-charge, which is calculated only upon cereals. If things come to the worst, the farmer can go into another trade, turn bailiff or even butcher; the squire can let his house or his shooting, and it is not probable that all his eggs are in one basket; above all, he has leisure and skill to manage his affairs. The parson, on the other hand, is not by training a man of business; and when, through causes for which he is not responsible, he finds his income dwindling year after year, he has no resource. If he endeavours, as he sometimes does, to speculate in stocks, for all the joint-stock companies send him their prospectuses, he very promptly comes to grief. Every one cannot take pupils, or sell lithographed sermons, or review for the *Guardian*, and the

bishops are chary of giving leave to let the glebe house ; there are, in short, no ways by which the man who is a parson and nothing more can make up for this collapse in his income. And when laymen reflect that no life requires so much devotion of time and interest, so much quiet thought, so much freedom from personal cares as the clerical life, they at least cannot regret that there should be this disability. But then it follows that the parson, not being a business man, must not be treated as if he were, and be left to rise and fall with the market ; he should be set free from such outside anxieties to pursue his proper work unhindered.

Are things, then, it will be asked, getting very bad? The answer is, They are already very bad indeed. Any one who opens Crockford will find the income of each living given in two forms, its value and its gross income, with a considerable difference between them. Let me illustrate from the living, a good one, which I myself held until recently. Its value is put down as £395 in tithe rent-charge (*i.e.* the sum fixed by the commissioners in 1836 to be paid by the landowners in lieu of tithes in kind), together with the rent of fifty-six acres of glebe. Tithe rent-charge was arranged to vary each year with the average price of certain cereals for the seven previous years. In 1883 it was exactly at par, and my predecessor in that year received the whole sum of £395 ; when I came to the living at the end of 1884,

the rent-charge was at £98 6*s.* 2*d.* per cent.; in 1900 for each £100 I received only £66 15*s.* 9¾*d.*; and the whole tithe rent-charge was £263 16*s.* 6*d.* instead of £395. The glebe rents, as to arable land, have fallen from twenty-five shillings to twenty shillings in some cases, in others to fifteen shillings an acre. In parishes where the income is derived not from tithe rent-charge but altogether from the rent of glebes, the fall in value has been much greater, and where the farms will not let it has reached vanishing point.

But when the present value of the living has thus been ascertained, this does not at once give the sum at the parson's disposal for housekeeping expenses. In other words, it is *gross* and not *net* income. Like his lay brethren, the parson has to pay taxes and rates, and though the latter have, since the Tithe Rating Relief Act, been reduced by a half, they are sufficiently heavy; and there are besides a number of charges to be met, varying with each diocese and parish, which considerably reduce the residue. I am allowed to submit two or three balance-sheets drawn from different parts of the country, for the statements in which I have authority, in order that the reader may have some insight into the actual state of clerical finances. But, first, as I have given one side of my own professional balance-sheet, I will add the other. It is for 1900, the year in which I vacated the benefice :—

EXAMPLE I.

Dr.	£	*s.*	*d.*		£	*s.*	*d.*
Tithe rent-charge ...	263	16	6	Poor rate	20	14	6
Glebe rents	69	16	6	School rate (voluntary)[1]	5	0	0
				Archdeacon's fees ...	0	13	0
				Queen Anne's Bounty[2]	1	9	2
				Fire insurance on chancel,[3] house, etc.	3	18	6
				House duty	2	8	9
				Land tax	3	11	0
				One year's share of £207 16*s.* 3*d.* paid for dilapidations incurred in last five years[4]	41	11	3
					79	6	2
				Balance	254	6	10
	£333	13	0		£333	13	0

It thus becomes evident that a living whose normal value is £500 is worth to-day, when income tax has been paid, less than half that sum. It offers, in fact, the amount that kind-hearted people are accustomed, when they discuss this question, to fix upon as a reasonable minimum stipend. Most people would argue that £250 is a sum upon which a clergyman

[1] In Board districts the school rate will be double or treble this, and the voluntary subscriptions will have to be paid in addition.

[2] This is a fund to augment poor benefices, instituted by Queen Anne, who surrendered to it her right, once the Pope's, to first-fruits and tenths. From this fund grants are made equal to the amount raised locally. In 1895 a capital sum was granted of £35,800 in augmentation of 138 benefices, *i.e.* the incomes of these livings were raised about £7 each.

[3] The rector is liable for the repair, insurance, etc., of the chancel.

[4] This sum constitutes a considerable rent. In addition to it an annual sum of from £12 to £15 had been spent in the previous years of the quinquennium for repairs.

with a small family might be able, with economy, to live in the country. But then it must be well understood that by this is meant £250 *net.* Housekeepers may find it interesting to divide up this sum among the various necessary heads of expense; such as butcher, grocer, dairy, garden seeds, coals and wood, clothes and boots, washing, servants (?), odd man or boy (?), pony (?), newspaper, stamps, books (?), schooling, holidays, doctor and drugs, wine for the influenzic, life insurance, subscriptions (coal club, treats, flower show, etc.), charities. But to proceed with the balance-sheets—

EXAMPLE II.

Dr.	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Tithe rent-charge ...	152	13	6	Poor rates	8	10	0
Glebe rents	54	0	0	Archdeacon's fees and Queen Anne's Bounty	1	8	0
				Repairs to chancel ...	4	0	0
				House duty	1	17	0
				Land tax	3	10	0
				Expenses of tithe collection[1]	8	0	0
				Life insurance[2] ...	41	2	6
					68	7	6
				Balance	138	6	0
	£206	13	6		£206	13	6

[1] The expenses of tithe collection are of course lighter or heavier according as the payers are few or many. In some parts of the country a dinner is expected.

[2] Objection may be taken to the inclusion of a life insurance policy in this balance-sheet as not being a *necessary* charge. But I venture to say that for a clergyman without private means, such a charge is necessary. In this case it is large in proportion to the income, but it must be observed the income has sunk more than £100 since the policy was taken out. Nothing is entered here for fire insurance, which

In this case a sum of £138 6*s.* is the available income of the clergyman of the place. He has six children of an age to require education. There are happily schools partially endowed, in order to help the poorer clergy in this matter, but even in them the expense per head does not fall below £15, and may be £20. If four of the six children are at school at one time, this would leave a balance of £76, *i.e.* thirty shillings a week, for food and clothing.

EXAMPLE III.

Dr.	£	*s.*	*d.*	*Cr.*	£	*s.*	*d.*
Tithe rent-charge ...	81	7	6	First-fruits[1]	15	15	11
Glebe rent	166	1	6	Tenths	1	11	6
Wayleave	30	0	0	Clergy Pension Fund[2]	4	9	3
				Poor rates[3]	3	13	9
				Life insurance ...	13	12	1
				House and paddock repairs	2	18	4
				Income and property tax	8	17	9½
				Voluntary school rate	1	3	5½
					52	2	1
				Balance	225	7	11
	£277	9	0		£277	9	0

is a dangerous omission; nor for house and glebe repairs. These last, if neglected till the living is vacant, would become a first charge upon the life insurance.

[1] These first-fruits and tenths are the payments to Queen Anne's Bounty Fund, the former, as its name implies, being paid the first year only of enjoying a benefice.

[2] The Clergy Pension Fund has been lately established to pay an annuity of £15 15*s.* on reaching the age of sixty-five on every annual payment of two guineas begun at the age of twenty-four.

[3] The poor rates are small in proportion to the income, because as most of this is from glebe rents, the rates will be paid by the occupier. The fire insurance here, too, seems to have been dropped.

In this case there are eight children whose ages run from four to sixteen years. I will exhibit one more balance-sheet because it contains a few new features. It is for the year 1897.

Dr. EXAMPLE IV. *Cr.*

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Tithe rent-charge ...	12	14	0	Queen Anne's Bounty	1	1	3
Glebe rent	261	0	0	Poor rates	3	16	11
Fees	2	2	0	Life insurance ...	53	16	10
Grant from charity ...	20	0	0	Fire insurance ...	3	3	10
				River Maintenance rate	1	10	2
				Annual payment for repair of buildings, and collection of income	28	13	4
				House repairs ...	3	11	0
				Tithe not recovered ...	3	8	8
				Rent not recovered ...	32	16	8
				Land tax	20	0	0
				School rate and church expenses	6	1	3
					157	19	11
				Balance	137	16	1
	£295	16	0		£295	16	0

The interest of this last case is that, while the apparent *net* income is only a few pounds short of £300, this is reduced more than £100 further by losses in rent and by necessary charges, so that when the life insurance is paid there remains for household expenses only a sum of £137 16*s.* 1*d.*, or less than the wage of a head gardener. The clergyman whose balance-sheet this is has six children.

But it will perhaps be urged, these are exceptional

cases, with which existing charities, if properly supported, should be competent to deal. Alas! it is not so. Charities such as the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy and the Poor Clergy Relief Corporation have done and are doing excellent work, as their several reports show, but the present distress is far beyond their means to cope with. Two of the cases I have adduced are average cases, and one is even above the average, and they are quoted for that reason. I have said nothing of benefices whose annual *net* value is *below* £100. Of these there are 1491 in England and Wales, and they, we must hope, would only be held by persons of sufficient private means. There comes a time, however, in the life of a curate when he longs to settle down; vicars, he knows, prefer young men; and when a living of this sort offers, and such may usually be had for the asking, he is tempted to think too much of the rent-free house, which is really not rent-free, of the possibilities of the garden,[1] of pupils, or of literature in odd moments, and so to embark on a fight with fortune which cannot but have a disastrous issue. I have known cases of this sort, but they are too painful to dwell upon, and for my present purpose they are almost beside the point. For I wish to make

[1] The garden, if he cannot be his own gardener, will cost him many times the value of the vegetables it supplies. I know of one clergyman who, when through ill health he could no longer work his garden himself, turned it into a rabbit warren, and so found a substitute for the butcher's meat he could no longer afford.

clear not that there are livings in England which are starvings—that is an old story—but that the *average* living, which twenty years ago might have supported a careful housekeeper in decency, is now altogether insufficient for this purpose, and needs augmentation. Omitting all further mention of the lowest class of living, I will refer my readers to a table drawn up by Canon Burnside, and printed at the conclusion of this paper, from which it will be seen that there are 4704 benefices, the income of which is over £100 and under £200, the average net value being only £154.

I shall assume, then, that the fact of a prevailing clerical poverty is now granted, and proceed to speak of various proposals to deal with it. The solution that first presents itself to the ordinary letter-writer in the journals is a general redistribution of Church property. It is idle to deny that the State which has more than once contemplated disendowment, has the abstract right to carry out a scheme of redistribution. To a certain extent such work is familiar to us in the action of the Ecclesiastical Commission in regard to episcopal incomes. But in regard to benefices the matter is different. While the right of presentation to the better endowed benefices remains in private hands, any such redistribution by the Church is impossible, and by the State it would not be attempted. Nor can it be said to be really desirable. The princely incomes which were for a

little while enjoyed by the vicars of such rapidly growing manufacturing towns as Leeds or Rochdale have already been distributed among the new district churches that have sprung up around them; and where the income of a living in the country makes an imposing appearance in the Clergy List, it will generally be found that the area of the parish is very large, with perhaps two or three hamlets, each having its chapel-of-ease, and requiring the permanent service of a curate-in-charge. The best-endowed country living of which I have any personal knowledge used to be returned at the gross value of £1600; the present value is about £1200. Out of this a quarter of the old *gross* income, *i.e.* £400, is drawn by the late vicar as a retiring pension, and with the remainder the present vicar, after paying all dues and rates, has to serve four hamlet churches, besides the church of his parish. But even if the vicar could depend upon so large an income for his own purposes as £750, is there anything in this to outrage public sentiment? Is it degrading to a clergyman to be free from money anxieties, to be able to educate his children at the cheaper grammar schools, to occasionally buy a book, or occasionally take a holiday, and have a margin for charity? Is it unreasonable in him to wish to do such things unless he happen to have private means? If the Churchman in the street would not have allotted this sufficient income to the parson of his own parish, need his eye be evil because some

old lord of the manor took a more generous view of a clergyman's deserts? Let us by all means ensure that none of the beneficed clergy shall have a less stipend than £250 a year, but let us not grudge to others their better fortune and forbid any living to exceed this sum.[1] However, as I have said, the scheme is not one of practical politics, because many of the larger livings are in private patronage.

Again, it is sometimes asked, would it not meet the case to revive Easter offerings? The rubric provides that "yearly at Easter every Parishioner shall reckon with the Parson, Vicar, or Curate, or his or their Deputy or Deputies, and pay to them or him all Ecclesiastical Duties accustomably due, then and at that time to be paid." Well, there are many reasons why such a revival would in most country places be impracticable. To begin with, it requires some violence to modern habits and feelings for a parson, vicar, or curate, to send round the alms-bag for his own needs. He recognizes, no doubt, that

[1] The argument for keeping larger benefices as rewards for service is often urged, and as often ridiculed. Coleridge in his *Table Talk* discusses the point, and rightly lays down that the obvious fact that many have *not* in time past been given for merit is no argument against endeavouring to use them so more generally. St. Paul seems to favour the practice in 1 Tim. v. 17: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of *double* honour, especially those who labour in the word and in teaching. For the Scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. And, The labourer is worthy of his hire." The quotations imply that the "honour" referred to was *honorarium*.

the labourer is worthy of his hire, and that the ox should not be muzzled. He does not forget that one quarter of the offertory sentences relate to the duty of maintaining the ministry; but for all that to "sing an offertory" for himself while the churchwardens went from pew to pew would be intolerable to any self-respecting person. And strong reasons would reinforce the natural distaste. It would very much interfere with the clergyman's freedom of remonstrance with the poorer parishioners if he were in the habit of receiving their alms. If dissenters envy Churchmen the independence they derive from endowments, Churchmen are likely to think twice before surrendering this independence. But, it will be said, all who come to country churches are not peasants. No; but then it is just these others who are hardest hit by agricultural depression. Tithe rent-charge has fallen low, but not low enough to content the yeoman. He cannot be expected to remember that this charge was a charge on the land when he bought it, and therefore does not come out of his own pocket. If he pays his tithes a half-year or a year after they come due, he thinks he has already done for the clergyman more than could reasonably be expected of him. The country squires, too, are in no position to be generous. It would certainly be a good thing to revive the old idea that Easter offerings are due to the clergy, and let them be given to the local branch of a general Sustentation

Fund. But the sums collected in most country parishes could not be large.

If then it be admitted, as all must admit who will pay attention to the facts, that the Church needs a large measure of re-endowment, and if it be admitted also, as by Churchmen it will not be denied, that the support of the clergy is as much a Christian duty as the building of churches or maintenance of hospitals, there should need but few words to commend the Queen Victoria Clergy Fund to the alms of the faithful. The history of the fund, its methods of work, and how far they have hitherto succeeded in their object, may be ascertained from the Annual Reports.[1] The aim of the fund is naturally to collect money from all quarters, and apply it where there is the greatest need. It proceeds, therefore, to organize in every diocese a branch fund which affiliates itself to the central fund by the payment of *one-fifth* of its annual income. In this way, while the bulk of the money raised in each diocese goes to the support of its own incumbents, and so local patriotism is stimulated, the central fund is enabled to help the poorer districts, not only from funds paid directly to it, but from the contributions of the more wealthy dioceses. At present the rich diocese of Liverpool is holding aloof, but it is hoped that more generous counsels will by-and-by prevail. The grants made

[1] The office of the Society is at Church House, Dean's Yard. The secretary is C. Guise Mitford, Esq.

to the several dioceses are given in block, and are distributed by the local organizations at their discretion; and they are employed because of the present distress in augmentation of the *income* of benefices, not by way of permanent endowment, which is the method of Queen Anne's Bounty, though the fund is prepared to hold and apply sums which are specially so dedicated. The Report for 1900 says that "the amount received by the central fund in donations, etc., during 1899 for the purpose of annual grants was £9343 7*s.* 3*d.* In addition to this sum £5623 9*s.* 9*d.* was contributed by the affiliated Diocesan Organizations, as one-fifth quota of money raised in 1898 for annual grants, thus making a total of £14,966 17*s.*" In the previous year the total was nearly half as much again, viz. £21,619 14*s.* 11*d.* What will it be in 1901?[1] When it is known that Lord Egerton of Tatton estimates that a million a year is needed to raise all the poor benefices to £250 it will be understood that a good deal remains to be done. In fact, Churchmen have to learn over again a lesson which our forefathers understood, and which their munificence has enabled us to forget, that it is "a clearly defined Christian duty" to contribute towards the support of the clergy. Dissenters recognize this, but to the present generation of Churchmen the idea is

[1] The answer, as appears from the Fifth Annual Report issued as this paper passes the press, is £14,308 4*s.* 8*d.*; a constantly diminishing fund to meet a constantly increasing poverty.

strange. I once knew a gentleman who apologized for having been mistakenly supposed to take the liberty of so contributing. The appeal must lie to the wealthy, but it need not lie to them exclusively. Annual subscriptions of five shillings would soon tell in the total. But, of course, to the wealthy the appeal must lie especially, and the wealthy at present are those engaged in commerce. It may be pointed out to them that, as the first endowment of the Church came from the new heritage of landowners in England, so the second endowment should come from England's new commercial wealth. Mr. Gladstone, speaking on behalf of the St. Asaph branch of this fund, put very pointedly a fact that needs to be remembered — that the commercial classes have actually gained by the very depression of agriculture under which the landowners and the country clergy are at present suffering. From that speech I take leave to quote a few sentences—

"It is not landlords nowadays in whose hands the great bulk of the wealth of the country is placed. Reference to the return of the Income Tax will show you that the landed income of the country now forms a very small proportion of the total income, not of the nation at large, but of those who must be considered the wealthy classes of the nation. The wealthy classes of the nation have in no respect been injured by the pressure that has come upon the landlords and upon the clergy. On the contrary, the

wealthy classes of the nation have largely benefited by that pressure, because they have enjoyed the whole advantage of the cheapness of commodities of the first necessity, which has been such a blessing to the country. . . . The wealth of the country lies mainly with the commercial classes, and the commercial classes are aggregated in the great towns. It is in London, in Liverpool, in Manchester, in Leeds, in Birmingham, in the great centres of population, that wealth has been accumulated; and it is upon the laity of those dioceses that we are especially entitled to make a call, and to conjure them to stretch out the hand of Christian bounty, I might almost say of Christian decency, for the purpose of relieving the straits and hard necessities under which the clergy of the rural parishes are now living."

Canon Burnside's Report upon the Value of Clerical Incomes.

"This report, representing the value of clerical incomes, has been prepared by careful and detailed examination of the Annual Statistical Returns furnished by the parochial clergy at the request of the Bishops.

"The net value in each case is given, and this has been arrived at by making certain deductions from the gross value as follows:—

"The gross income is derived from all available sources. (1) Tithe rent-charge, the average for the year being taken. (2) Rent of glebe for year. (3) Pew rents. (4) Church collections and Easter offerings. (5) Fees and Easter dues. (6) Interest on funded property, etc. (7) Annual income from Ecclesiastical Commissioners and other sources.

"The net value is ascertained by making the following deductions:—(1) Parochial rates and taxes (not income tax). (2) Insurance of chancel, glebe premises. (3) Tenths, mortgage dues, etc. (4) Cost of collection of income. (5) A pension under Resignation Act. (6) Any other annual payment chargeable upon the benefice. (7) Necessary repairs to glebe premises. (8) Amount of stipend paid to assistant-clergy by the incumbent out of his own income, but only when the population, number of churches, and services necessitate the employment of such additional help.

"Upon this basis of calculation, and making full allowance for all the advantages conferred by the reduction of rates under the recent Tithe Rating Relief Act, the average net value of a benefice in England and Wales for the year ending Easter, 1900, is £248; to this must be generally added the value of a parsonage-house, though in many cases this provision does not exist. There are no sources of information to which we can refer to ascertain the

present average value of a glebe house. In a report, however, furnished to Parliament in the year 1890, touching the revenues of the Church of England, the parsonage-houses are there represented as being assessed at the total sum of £518,054. Now, if we accept this as our basis of calculation, the average value of a parsonage-house would be £37, and this being added to the average income, £248, would make the total net annual value of a benefice £285.

"In presenting their report to Parliament in 1890 upon ecclesiastical revenues, the Commissioners pointedly drew attention to the following facts, that more than two-thirds of the cost of the parsonage-houses may be regarded as derived from private benefactions and from the payment of the clergy out of their incomes."

TABLE SHOWING THE TOTAL NUMBER OF BENEFICES IN THE DIOCESES OF ENGLAND AND WALES, THEIR AVERAGE NET VALUE, AND RELATIVE POPULATION.

At Net Value.	Average Net Value.	No. Benefices in 2 Provinces.	No. of Benefices at the Specified Values, with a Population varying as follows, *i.e.* under—								
			200	400	600	800	1000	2000	4000	6000	Over 6000
Under £100 ...	£67	1491	549	384	164	74	63	110	81	29	37
,, 200 ...	154	4704	918	1195	651	411	267	576	351	165	170
,, 300 ...	245	4577	309	725	603	398	309	625	570	445	593
,, 400 ...	339	2001	67	227	286	165	115	237	253	228	423
,, 500 ...	442	725	18	68	96	65	69	115	91	67	136
,, 600 ...	544	374	8	19	34	48	35	65	54	40	71
,, 700 ...	644	160	4	6	10	14	15	26	27	26	32
Over 700 ...	906	210	8	8	16	10	9	30	32	37	60
Totals ...	248	14242	1881	2632	1860	1185	882	1784	1459	1037	1522

DIOCESES OF THE SOUTHERN PROVINCE.

TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF BENEFICES IN THE DIOCESES OF THIS PROVINCE, THEIR AVERAGE NET VALUE, AND RELATIVE POPULATION.

At Net Value.	No. Benefices in Province.	Average Net Value.	No. of Benefices at the Specified Values, with a Population varying as follows, *i.e.* under—								
			200	400	600	800	1000	2000	4000	6000	Over 6000
Under £100 ...	1370	£67	523	347	150	69	58	100	69	25	29
,, 200 ...	3936	153	839	1049	538	336	216	460	244	128	126
,, 300 ...	3478	244	286	632	500	327	241	470	382	277	363
,, 400 ...	1415	338	62	202	258	140	94	180	151	133	195
,, 500 ...	559	441	18	57	87	58	59	99	60	46	75
,, 600 ...	216	544	7	14	28	37	33	54	38	26	49
,, 700 ...	122	642	4	4	6	12	13	20	21	22	20
Over 700 ...	150	885	8	8	12	6	9	24	21	23	39
Totals ...	11316	234	1747	2313	1579	985	723	1407	986	680	896

DIOCESES OF THE NORTHERN PROVINCE.

TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF BENEFICES IN THE DIOCESES OF THIS PROVINCE, THEIR AVERAGE NET VALUE, AND RELATIVE POPULATION.

At Net Value.	No. Benefices in Province.	Average Net Value.	No. of Benefices at the Specified Values, with a Population varying as follows, *i.e.* under—								
			200	400	600	800	1000	2000	4000	6000	Over 6000
Under £100 ...	121	£66	26	37	14	5	5	10	12	4	8
,, 200 ...	768	156	79	146	113	75	51	116	107	37	44
,, 300 ...	1099	248	23	93	103	71	68	155	188	168	230
,, 400 ...	586	341	5	25	28	25	21	57	102	95	228
,, 500 ...	166	448	—	11	9	7	10	16	31	21	61
,, 600 ...	88	546	1	5	6	11	2	11	16	14	22
,, 700 ...	38	650	—	2	4	2	2	6	6	4	12
Over 700 ...	60	960	—	—	4	4	—	6	11	14	21
Totals ...	2926	271	134	319	281	200	159	377	473	357	626

FALLACIES IN THE RITUAL CONTROVERSY

FALLACIES IN THE RITUAL CONTROVERSY.

1. THE most conspicuous of the many fallacies that are distinguishing the controversy about ritual in the Church is the assumption borrowed from Sir William Harcourt that it is nothing but the ancient and fundamental antinomy between clerk and layman. If that were indeed so, it would undoubtedly have been difficult for the party Sir William champions to secure a more redoubtable protagonist; for his sentiments towards the clergy seem to be those of angry contempt, and his vocabulary of vituperation is unrivalled. Of course, the fact is that the struggle is not between clergy and laity at all—for a struggle of that nature could not last for five minutes—it is a struggle between laymen on one side and laymen on the other, each party being convinced that it has behind it both the intelligence of England and the formularies of the Church, and the Church being for the moment without a final court of appeal whose decisions both parties will accept as binding. Sir William Harcourt found it expedient to ignore this plain fact, although, with Lord Halifax

playing the corresponding *rôle* to his own, he must have found it difficult to do so. But to recognize that the laity of England is divided would have compelled him to greater politeness in his philippics,[1] for laymen are apt to resent abuse; it would have required him also to deal less in denunciation and more in argument; and, more than all, it would have destroyed an invaluable appeal to popular prejudice, for the "average sensual man" is not fond of the clergy, and easily believes ill of a class with whom he seldom comes in close contact. The fallacy, then, though so patent, is worth a moment's consideration because of its controversial value. Relying upon it, Sir William Harcourt has filled his letters to *The Times* with such equivocal sentences as this: "The time has arrived when the *laity*, who are the Church, of which the clergy are the ministers, are, I believe, fully resolved to assert and maintain the rights which are secured to them by the Constitution of the National Church." But if Sir William Harcourt will only prosecute his ecclesiastical studies a little further,[2] he will find that the rights of the laity are insisted upon with even greater passion than his own by the party on whom he seeks to fix the obnoxious name of "clerical."

It is an interesting fact, familiar to those who study Church history, that whenever things have been

[1] A series of letters to *The Times*, reprinted as a pamphlet entitled *Lawlessness in the English Church*.

[2] See *Essays on Church Reform*, edited by the Bishop of Worcester.

pushed to extremes, either of excess or defect, whether in doctrine or ritual, it is not the clergy but the laity who have been the prime movers. The clergy do not make good leaders of a party. A successful leader should know his own mind and not too much besides; he must not be hampered by a capacity for seeing both sides of a question, nor must he be the ready prey of scruples. The ordinary person wants to be told that he is right and that everybody else is wrong, and that is what only a layman has the audacity to tell him. In every profession you will find laymen ready to rush in where the trained expert treads very cautiously. So it has been of late in the ritual controversy. So it has probably been in the matter of ritual excess. If the cases where illegal rites or ceremonies have been used were investigated, I am confident it would be generally found that the motive power has been supplied by laymen, with their strong sense of logic, their imperious will, their very scanty and partial information on the law of the Church and the history of the particular usage, and their very profound contempt for any view of the question but their own, not least for that of the Ordinary. In the late Bishop of London's last address to his Ruridecanal Conferences, he lays it down that the Church of the Middle Ages went astray through its constant desire to meet the demands of popular devotion. In other words, it was the laymen who led, and the clergy who, in their benevolence,

did not sufficiently resist.[1] But then, as now, it was the laymen of the other side who, when the inevitable reaction came, led the persecution, and hounded on the reluctant bishops;[2] and now, as then, it is the clergy who have to bear the brunt of the struggle between the opposing factions. Mr. Kensit's lambs are in direct succession from the London prentices who mobbed Convocation in the first year of Edward

[1] Here is a characteristic story: "The new service book was used throughout England for the first time on Whit-Sunday, the 9th of June [1549]. On Whitsun Monday the parish priest of Sampford Courtenay, a village of Dartmoor in Devon, was going into his church for the morning prayers, when a group of his parishioners, among them a tailor named Underhill, and Hegar, a labourer, came about him asking 'what he would do and what service he would say.' That 'he would say the same service that he had said the day before, according to the law set forth,' was the answer of the priest. But the villagers replied, 'We will keep the old and ancient religion, as our forefathers before us have done,' etc. The priest yielded, put on his vestments, and said mass in the old language with all the customary ceremonies."—Dixon's *History of the Church*, iii. 45.

[2] Canon Dixon has shown this in regard to the Marian persecution. An interesting case on the Protestant side is found in the Memoirs of a certain Edward Underhill. He brought the Vicar of Stepney in King Edward's days, for interrupting the Protestant preachers in his church, before Archbishop Cranmer; "who was too full of lenity. A little he rebuked him, and bade him do no more so. 'My lord,' said I, 'methinks you are too gentle unto so stout a Papist.' 'Well,' said he, 'we have no law to punish him by.' 'We have, my lord,' said I. 'If I had your authority I would be so bold to un-Vicar him, or minister some sharp punishment unto him, and such other. If ever it come to their turn, they will show you no such favour.' 'Well,' said he, 'if God so provide, we must abide it.' 'Surely,' said I, 'God will never give you thanks for this; but rather take the sword from such as will not use it upon His enemies.' And thus we departed. The like favour is showed now [*i.e.* in Elizabeth's days], and, therefore, the like plague will follow."—Arber's *English Garner*, iv. 86.

VI., and if Sir William Harcourt finally triumphs, it will be seen whether he will not emulate the Protector Somerset in hanging "ritualistic" vicars from their own steeples.

I may, perhaps, be asked how it happens, if the laymen of the Church, properly so called, are at present ranged under two banners, that a "Laymen's League" has been formed in order to carry through Parliament a particularly drastic measure for the ejection of "ritualistic" clergy. The answer is partly that given above, that the name of "layman" is a good fighting name; but, further, that the league is more exactly styled the "*Liverpool* Laymen's League," and the Liverpool layman, speaking roundly, has marked characteristics. The type, which runs with degrees of refinement through all classes except a few families of hereditary culture, and some others which are reactionary, is most simply described as Orange. A reminiscence, if I may be pardoned the egotism, will explain what Orangeism means in its lowest terms, and to-day it is the lowest expression of an idea that is apt to exercise the greatest political influence.[1] Nineteen years ago I was attached as assistant curate to St. Thomas's Church, Liverpool Docks, then in the patronage of Mr. Gladstone. The vicar, who had been lately appointed, found the parish

[1] As I revise this paper for republication, I observe that a Mr. Wise, who is the Mr. Kensit of the Northern Counties, has been returned at the head of the poll for the Liverpool School Board!

entirely neglected and the church without a congregation, except upon one day in the year when the Orange lodges assembled to protest against the Pope. This unauthorized commination service the new vicar would not allow, and then a persecution was organized. It was resolved to give him, for a thorn in the flesh, an Orange churchwarden. The church was a district church of the vast parish of Walton, so that it seemed the simplest matter possible to order up a few lodges of Orangemen to swamp at the Easter vestry whatever congregation the vicar's energy had succeeded in getting together. Luckily, after the first meeting, which was attended in force by the Orangemen, and adjourned by the vicar at midnight, it was discovered that the electors to the office of churchwarden were, in that particular church, not the parishioners, but the seat-holders. So the Orangemen had to be content with sending deputations to the Sunday services to face west at the creed, and stamp out of church if the word "altar" or "sacrifice" occurred in lessons or sermon. The ceremonial at the church during my vicar's incumbency was of the normal type, with no vestments, or other "rags of Popery" except the choir surplices, to object to. I tell this trifling story because no one who has not lived in Liverpool can have an idea how entirely political and unreligious these so-called "Protestant" organizations are. It needs but a spark to kindle a street row between them and the Irish Roman

Catholics. On Orange Day the Protestant children, if they are not well looked after, lie in wait for the Roman children, who have their revenge on St. Patrick's Day. The Members for Liverpool, who to save their seats had to bring in a ridiculous Discipline Bill, deserve all commiseration.

2. A second set of fallacies, equally patent and equally noxious, has been industriously propagated in a book written by a Mr. Walter Walsh, and called *The Secret History of the Oxford Movement.* The book might compendiously be described as an enormous example of the fallacy *a dicto secundum quid.* It comes to this: Because secret (political) societies, such as those of Carbonari, are dangerous to a state, therefore secret *religious* societies are dangerous. It remains, then, to prove that certain well-known High Church societies are "secret." For this purpose, passages are collected from their printed reports in which members are requested not to use postcards in writing upon the society's business, or are cautioned against allowing the society's papers to lie about for inquisitive eyes. Mr. Walsh's modesty prevents his drawing the obvious conclusion that it was only from such as he, the spies of a prosecuting society, in the active days of the Public Worship Regulation Act (1874), that there was any need for concealment.[1]

[1] It is significant that most of Mr. Walsh's stories of secret conclaves belong to the seventies. His quotations in the Appendix, "What the Ritualists teach," are for the most part as antiquated. There are no doubt silly manuals still issued (such as one now lying before me, which

And then comes in Mr. Walsh's second great fallacy: Because the Church Association exists to defend the Reformed Church of England, it follows that every point, either in doctrine or ritual, that is distasteful to the Church Association, must be of the nature of treason to the Reformed Church. Hence all High Churchmen are traitors, and every distinctively High Church doctrine is "Romanizing." Mr. Walsh ignores the fact that the Prayer-book was settled after the Savoy Conference in an Anti-Puritan sense, and ingeniously mixes up doctrines then definitely allowed in our Church with those against which it still protests. He treats the doctrine of the "Real Presence" in the Sacrament as identical with "Transubstantiation;" he everywhere implies that "Prayers for the Dead" are inseparable from the doctrine of "Purgatory." No doubt Mr. Walsh has produced a quotation from a sermon which justifies him in this latter identification;[1] just as, in all his researches, he has

advises those who are "unbaptized, excommunicate, or possessed with devils" to leave church after the sermon), and it would be a boon to the Church if the publication of these could be restrained. But one would think more of Mr. Walsh's sincerity if in all his forty pages he had quoted a single living writer of eminence, and more of his judgment if he had distinguished between what is Roman and what is English and Catholic.

[1] It does not follow because a Roman word is used that a Roman doctrine is taught. Most Christians believe in "an intermediate state," and few would care to deny that it may be a state of purification. But to call it "Purgatory," though the word denotes no more than this, is in Protestant ears to imply the Romish doctrine of Indulgence; just as to use the word "Mass," though the word itself is

discovered one case of scandal arising from the practice of private confession. Then he employs a useful method in induction, and treats the exceptional case as typical. But his most far-reaching fallacy, considering the half-educated class at which he aims, is *innuendo*, which may be reckoned a very fruitful branch of the *argumentum ad populum*. He tells, with many capitals and italics, the story of Newman's secession to Rome; roundly asserts that he was always Roman in sympathy, which those who have read the two volumes of his letters know to be untrue; and hints that all High Churchmen are as insincere. He hints also at other vices. I don't know how he does it, but somehow Mr. Walsh manages to convey the impression that both absolution and celibacy are breaches of the seventh commandment. I wonder if he would accuse St. Paul of "celibacy"!

3. A third common fallacy, though of a much less harmful nature, is the idea, sometimes defended, but more often assumed, that unity in creed must necessarily be accompanied by uniformity in ritual. This argument is put with admirable precision in the following sentence from one of Sir William Harcourt's letters: "An establishment is designed for all, and therefore must by the nature of things have

meaningless, is to imply the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Churchmen who use these degraded words have themselves to blame if they are misrepresented.

one rule and measure for all"![1] In its original context this Procrustean aphorism hardly arrests attention, embedded as it is among insults to the Episcopal Bench and threats to unfrock the clergy. It is all in that fearless old sixteenth-century fashion,[2] and ought to have been printed in black letter and emphasized by full-blooded oaths like "By my halidom." But when we withdraw it from its own page, and look at it in the dry light of to-day, it looks less satisfactory. The modern spirit would suggest as an alternative: "An establishment is designed for all; and therefore must by the nature

[1] *Lawlessness in the National Church*, p. 82.

[2] And yet the highest wisdom of the sixteenth century had already declared against the policy with which Sir W. Harcourt has recently identified himself. Bacon, in his *Advertisement touching the Controversies of the Church*, gives excellent counsel, which should be read and taken to heart by statesmen to-day. "The present controversies," he says, "do not concern the *great* parts of the worship of God, of which it is true that there will be kept no unity in believing except it be entertained in worshipping; but *we* contend about ceremonies and things indifferent; in which kind if we would but remember that the ancient and true bonds of unity are 'one faith one baptism,' and not one ceremony one policy; if we would observe the league among Christians penned by our Saviour, 'He that is not against us is with us'; if we could but comprehend that saying, '*The diversities of ceremonies do set forth the unity of doctrine*,' and that other, 'Religion hath parts which belong to eternity and parts which pertain to time;' and if we did but know the virtue of silence and slowness to speak commended by St. James,—our controversies of themselves would close up and grow together; but most especially if we would leave the overweening and turbulent humours of these times, and revive the blessed proceedings of the Apostles and Fathers of the primitive Church, and say, 'Brother, if that which you set down as an assertion you would deliver by way of advice, there were reverence due to your counsel, whereas faith is not due to your affirmation.'"

of things have a latitude capable of comprehending all." It has been the tardy wisdom of our generation to recognize that all men are not framed by "one rule and measure," and therefore that, within necessary limits, as wide a diversity as possible should be tolerated. It is too crude and unhumorous a piece of affectation for any single person, even though it be Sir William Harcourt, to pose as the normal Churchman, with all his religious instincts and desires trimmed into the one perfect pattern by some private Act of Uniformity, which is to be enforced upon the rest of us. We have already a better model in St. Paul, who ranked charity the highest of the Christian graces, and "became all things to all men, if he might win some."

Moreover, it is merely a forensic fallacy to charge the Church of England with Congregationalism for allowing some diversity in usage to suit the mental capacity and æsthetic cultivation of various worshippers. Who would wish the service in every country parish to be as elaborate as that in St. Paul's, or that in St. Paul's to be simplified to the point at which it could be appreciated by a Berkshire labourer? Need they, then, be all alike in cities? Great scorn was heaped upon the late Bishop of London by Dr. Guinness Rogers for telling Mr. Kensit, after the ritual at St. Ethelburga's had been reduced within legal bounds, that if he still objected to the service he might find one elsewhere more

congenial to his taste. Dr. Rogers is naturally scornful of such "endowed Congregationalism." But to leave words and look at facts, is it not the case that all Londoners are, and must be, in this sense "Congregationalists"? There are two or three recognized types of worship, all allowable under the Act of Uniformity, arranged to suit two or three recognized types of worshippers; and it is not to be expected that all worshippers of one type should be found living in one parish. The age of Ghettoes is past in England. As each parishioner must count for one, and not even Mr. Kensit for more than one, common sense, as well as Christian charity, would suggest that they should sort themselves instead of quarrelling, and let the vestry or church council in every case, of course within legal limits, decide the ritual by a majority of votes. But as I understand Sir William Harcourt, he would have the ritual in all churches reduced to one level, and have this level fixed by the most Puritanical person who can be found in, or introduced into, the parish; and that because the Low Churchman is a "layman" in some esoteric sense in which a High Churchman is not. Sir William Harcourt is fond of that fine-sounding sentence from Edward VI.'s First Prayer-book about the different "uses" of Salisbury and Hereford, and York and Lincoln, which the use of "England" was to supplant, but he appears not to have understood that the difference of "use" referred to is a difference,

not of ceremony, but of office, and that the offices are still the same at the regular services in all English churches, high or low, and no one proposes to alter them. There may be an impertinent Ritualist here and there who has gone back to the "use of Sarum," but if so, he has doubtless by this time been admonished. Anyhow, it is idle to pretend that the "use of all England" is in peril. But accepting that use as common to all the churches, there is nothing inconsistent with it in a certain variety of ceremonial. The rubrics themselves contemplate variety by allowing psalms and canticles to be sung *or* said. Now, it happens that a diversity of usage has grown up in things not essential, owing partly to a real uncertainty as to the construction of the ornaments rubric, partly to a great development of hymnody; it seems therefore a pity suddenly to curtail this variety, and to disfranchise one or other party. So long as the Low Churchman is not compelled to see his own minister arrayed in anything but surplice, stole, and hood, why should he deny to his brother the vestments which he considers of obligation, especially as the stole, which the Low Churchman has elected to wear for choir offices, is a sacramental vestment, and must stand or fall with the chasuble? About incense I dare not speak, for it seems capable of exciting an asthma of angry feelings quite unintelligible to me; I would only say of it, first, that it seems to come well under our Church's definition of

allowable ceremonies, "such as be apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and special signification;" and further, that it was used on festivals, though doubtless not, as it is called, "ceremonially," by George Herbert, who would perhaps be accepted by the large majority of Englishmen as a typical Church of England parson.

4. To turn to a question upon which more rhetoric has been wasted than on most others, that of clerical obedience. Naturally, those who have reason to think the majority of bishops would give judgment on their side have made much of the lawlessness of the clergy, and even Sir William Harcourt, who has no respect for a bishop, still less for an archbishop, does not disdain to use their pastoral staves to cudgel their "insubordinate priests." The fallacy that runs through most of the accusations of disobedience is that they are made general, whereas what symptoms of recalcitrancy have shown themselves have been restricted to one or two definite particulars, upon which a large body of the "ritualistic" clergy are convinced that they have a good case. The public has but a short memory, and agitators have every reason for not reminding it that several points of ritual, for practising which High Churchmen used once to be called law-breakers, have now, after a closer investigation, been pronounced lawful. In other words, the protest (in some cases it may have been the disobedience) of the Ritualists

was vindicated. Who, then, can be surprised if they cherished the hope that they might be as successful when questions still in dispute were as patiently debated? Hence the widespread satisfaction which greeted the Archbishop's proposal to hear appeals on these ritual and ceremonial acts by counsel before ordering their discontinuance. No doubt the clergy in question would have preferred to plead before the canonical Church Court; but this being in abeyance, just as Bishop King decided to plead before Archbishop Benson sitting without assessors in a revived Court of Canterbury, so Lord Halifax strongly urged the clergy of his union to plead before the two Archbishops sitting in a Court improvised from the direction in the Prayer-book touching the interpretation of the rubrics. The latter judgments have not been as welcome to High Churchmen as were those of Archbishop Benson; but, except in a very few cases, they have been obeyed. Perhaps a word should be added here on the shallow and fallacious wit, which jeers at the distinction High Churchmen have insisted on between absolute and canonical obedience to their own ordinaries. One would have thought that the distinction could hardly be unintelligible to a nation which prides itself on its loyalty to the Crown, while it restricts the Sovereign's voice to a constitutional mouthpiece. But controversy acquaints parties, political and ecclesiastical, with strange bedfellows; and it must be gratifying to the

ghost of Laud, if he ever walks from Tower Hill as far as Fleet Street, to see the recent spread of the doctrine of passive obedience through the newspaper offices. Still, he must not presume too much upon one symptom. Passive obedience, when preached by Englishmen, invariably concerns other people. Ritualists used to preach it to Anti-Vaccinators till these were whitewashed; Anti-Vaccinators to the Peculiar People; and in the *Nineteenth Century* for March (1899) a respected Harrow master achieved the triumph of patting Mr. Kensit on the back and accusing the Ritualists of "mob-law" in one and the same paragraph. In fact, there is no little truth in the judgments recorded of Englishmen by the clever French undergraduate who has recently obliged us with his memories of Oxford, that we are "creatures of will rather than of intelligence," and that "supervision is incompatible with the peculiar independence" of our character.

5. It is admitted on all hands that the most important points at present in dispute concern the Reservation of the Sacrament and Auricular Confession. Reservation is virtually forbidden by the sixth rubric at the end of the Communion office; but, notwithstanding, it has for a long time been practised and tolerated in the poor districts of large cities, where the number of sick is too great to admit of repeated celebrations, and the conditions are such that a reverent celebration is impossible. Any one

who has worked in a poor parish knows what these conditions are. Sir William Harcourt may be right in his suggestion that the dwellings of the poor are no more incommodious to-day than they were in the sixteenth century, when the practice of celebrating in private houses was introduced; but they are certainly more numerous, and, what is still more to the point, the nature of contagious disease is better understood; and further, the clergy now are more zealous than they have been at any time since the date of the rubric (1662) to give the poorest what is their due as members of the Church. The rubric, it is well understood, was made to prevent what remained of the consecrated bread being put to profane uses, and was not directed against Reservation; nevertheless, it actually forbids it; and the objection to its being allowed to lapse like other antiquated rubrics, lies in the probability that some of the Romanizing clergy would introduce the services of Benediction, and Visiting the Sacrament, and similar practices forbidden in our Twenty-eighth Article. The best solution of the practical difficulty is that which has already been adopted by several bishops; while forbidding Reservation generally, to license it in certain crowded parishes, under restrictions which should make it serve its real purpose, and no other.

The subject of Confession is more difficult to handle temperately than that of Reservation, because

its abuse must necessarily be more far-reaching in its results. But, at least, it is possible for every one to understand what our Church allows and what it forbids; and nothing in the end can be gained by false witness. The Low Churchmen are plainly right in their contention that the English Church, by introducing public Confession and Absolution[1] into the Reformed Service, intended to supersede private Confession as the general rule, while still prescribing an opportunity for the latter in cases of sickness.[2] Further, in an exhortation in the Communion Office, the minister is directed to suggest to any one who cannot quiet his own conscience that he should go to some discreet and learned minister of God's Word and open his grief, "that by the ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive *the benefit of absolution*, together with ghostly counsel or advice." Sir William Harcourt in his reference to this passage (*Lawlessness*, etc., p. 39) sees fit to omit the words in italics; but any person who will read the exhortation without prejudice, cannot but

[1] This is no place to debate what is meant by priestly absolution; but that some function is laid by the English Church upon its ministers is shown by the office for the Ordering of Priests, where the Bishop is enjoined to say: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained." Sir William Harcourt's sneer, therefore, about "priests who *claim*" this power is unjustifiable.

[2] See the Order for the Visitation of the Sick: "Here shall the sick person be moved," etc.

allow that a minister of the English Church has no choice but to give absolution to a penitent, when he asks for it. So that it is idle to talk of putting down private Confession by process of law. An unprejudiced reader of the homily will admit no less clearly that a minister is not empowered to suggest private Confession to any but such as cannot quiet their own consciences; much less is he empowered to press it generally upon his flock. It follows that in the English Church private Absolution is a right that may be claimed, but private Confession is not a duty that may be urged. This somewhat paradoxical position is not the weakness but the strength of the English system; and if it could be loyally observed, it would reconcile the contending factions.

Admirable, however, as it undoubtedly is in theory, the English system presents not a few difficulties in practice. To begin with, the exhortation in the Communion Office is at present very seldom read, so that numberless congregations grow up in ignorance that their Church has made for them any provision of the sort—which is not fair; and, in the second place, parish clergymen who have no experience in hearing confessions would probably fail in the necessary "learning" and not improbably in the necessary "discretion." Moderate Churchmen undoubtedly express the Anglican theory when they speak of private Confession as medicine and not food; but medicine is useless unless it is known to exist,

can be obtained when needed, and is efficiently administered. Probably few religious people have come to mature life without having passed through a period when to go to Confession would have been of the greatest service to them; but the unfamiliarity of the idea, if it occurred to them at all, was sufficient to prevent its execution. This must be reckoned a weakness of the system. The suggestion has more than once been made that the Bishops should license a certain number of experienced clergy to hear confessions. There would be advantage in this, both as recognizing that private Confession has its own place in the Anglican system, and as preventing young and unfit persons from taking the duty upon them.

Lord Halifax has recently denied that in any case known to him has Confession been compelled; and compulsory Confession, being quite illegal, may be disregarded as a mere bogey. What disquiets many persons is not this, but the enjoining of habitual Confession as a religious duty, which is far from being a mere bogey; and the result of which is apt to be not, as might be pleaded, an increase of scrupulousness, but a more mechanical view of religion. Once, at the seaside, I was accosted in the street by a lady, who asked if I were a priest, explaining that she meant a Catholic priest, and by that a Roman Catholic. Her confessor was out for the day, and she very much wanted to go for a sail, but did not like to take the risk of accidents unless her conscience

could be cleared before she embarked. I need not repeat the conversation that followed; to the lady the moral of the interview was the inconvenience of our unhappy divisions; to me, I fear, it was the degradation of a valuable ordinance by its mechanical use.

6. There is a fallacy frequently employed by agitators on which I should have deemed it unnecessary to touch in a paper written for educated people, but for the recent experience of a visit to a meeting at Brighton, addressed by Mr. Kensit. At this meeting a drawing of the St. Paul's processional cross was exhibited, and received with hisses and cries of "Shame" by people who, to judge from their dress, belonged to the intelligent classes of society. On the platform there were several military officers. The speaker pledged himself to protest against the introduction of such an "idolatrous" image into the chief cathedral of our National Church, and his promise was welcomed with loud applause. He then proceeded to charge the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, and the clergy generally, with removing the Ten Commandments from their chancels in order that such breaches of the Second Commandment might not be brought home to them; and this astounding accusation was also greeted with cheers. Now, it is undoubtedly true that the Commandments have ceased of late to be employed as the principal decoration on the east wall of churches. In one's

youth they were stencilled on the white plaster in black with rubricated initials, or else painted in light blue on a chocolate ground, and either way their effect was not very magnificent, while they were totally illegible, so that architects have been inclined in recent years to substitute curtains or a reredos. But it is church architects and not the clergy who must bear what blame has been incurred, and any protest should be addressed to them. Anyhow, Mr. Kensit should be relieved to hear that the Second Commandment is still read in the Communion Office, and taught from the Catechism in Church schools.

The charge, revived from Puritan days, that to make any representation of Our Lord whatever, whether on canvas or glass or metal, is a breach of the Second Commandment, may have at first sight a plausible look; but it really rests on the fallacy that the Commandments are to be interpreted as the Law Courts interpret an Act of Parliament. The principle that the spirit was of more importance than the letter was laid down by Our Lord in the Sermon on the Mount, and illustrated by His own practice in regard to the Fourth Commandment. The Pharisees were perpetually accusing Him of breaking the Sabbath, as on Mr. Kensit's principle they were quite justified in doing, and His defence was that "the Sabbath was made for man." That is to say, that in interpreting the Commandment regard was

to be paid to its use and purpose. Now, one great purpose of the Second Commandment—if we may judge from the result which it accomplished—was to prevent the Jews from forgetting God's highest attributes of righteousness and mercy by employing symbols that could not suggest them. An ox might represent a god whose chief attribute was power; a bird, one whose chief attribute was omnipresence. But Jehovah was revealed as a God "merciful and gracious, and who would not clear the guilty." Hence it was far better for the people to have no representation of God at all than to have one which by its emphasis on what was of less consequence tended to obscure what was of greater consequence. But how is it possible to plead that any picture or statue of Christ must so inevitably misrepresent His character as to do harm to those who use it? If it be replied that what is objected to is not the mere representation but the worship of the representation, all that need be said is that there is really no danger of this, for in an age of universal School Boards no English laymen are so ill-instructed as to mistake a statue, much less a figure on a processional cross, for a living person, or even to credit them with miraculous powers.

THE CHURCH AND ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

THE CHURCH AND ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

ONE advantage, among not a few disadvantages, that have attended the removal of English education from the control of the National Church, has been the greater study given to education as a subject apart from religion; and one outcome of this independent study has been the clear conviction, in the minds of such students, that the most important work education has to perform is the moulding of character, and that to do this work effectually religion is indispensable. Our Trades Union Congress, indeed, in its fear of German competition, has recently passed a unanimous vote in favour of enlarged education by means of universal secular School Boards; but the Congress should take note of the fact that in Germany, which is the home of the science of education, the most advanced schemes now provide for religious teaching side by side with what is secular. We may hope that by our upper classes the need for a religious basis in education is already recognized, and if so, no one need grudge the thirty years that have been

spent in learning the lesson; and least of all should the Church repine. For besides the fact that the lesson tells wholly in her favour, she herself is much better equipped than at any former period for the task it lays upon her; not indeed in wealth, but in public confidence, and in zeal for educational work. From the Report of the National Society one learns that while the sum spent by the English Church upon education in the sixty years between 1811 and 1870 was £15,149,938, or a little more than £250,000 a year, in the thirty years since 1870 it has been £28,275,260, or nearly £950,000 a year.

Perhaps the present generation of Churchmen do not realize how much of the opportunity they have enjoyed of making up arrears they owe to the fact that the first Minister of Education was not only a religious man—the Premier, Mr. Gladstone, was that in an eminent degree—but also a man who was prepared to sacrifice to his religious convictions even his own personal popularity and advancement.[1] The educational tradition in England had, it is true, always been religious, and for many years the Government grant was dispensed through the two great religious societies, the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society. In 1853,

[1] "It does rest much with me just now whether or no the State shall decree against religion—decree that it is a thing of no account. Well, with my assent the State shall not do this, and I believe I can prevent it, though very probably by my own ostracism; but that does not matter."—*Life of W. E. Forster*, by T. Wemyss Reid, vol. i.

for example, the Committee of Council refused a grant to an exclusively secular school. But the Government which passed the Education Act of 1870 came into power upon the radical votes liberated by Mr. Disraeli's new household franchise, and the middle-class Nonconformists of Birmingham, Leeds, and other manufacturing towns, led by the veteran John Bright, thought they saw their long-cherished hope of disestablishing the Church at last about to be realized. The Birmingham Educational League, which had the support of the leading Dissenters throughout England, had formulated its plans for covering England with free schools which should be entirely secular; and this scheme was urged upon the Government with perfect confidence that it would be adopted. Mr. Forster, however, although himself a Radical and a Dissenter, would have nothing to do with the Birmingham scheme, partly, as he said, on the ground that it would quickly undermine the existing schools and drive out of the field most of those who cared for education; but chiefly because of the high value he attached to religious training. He cared for religious equality as much as any of his Dissenting friends, but he preferred religion even before religious equality; and he refused to have anything to do with a proposal that would have sacrificed the religious education of England to the mere jealousies and prejudices of sectaries and partisans. A short passage from Mr. Forster's speech

on the second reading of the Bill, in reply to an amendment promoted by the Birmingham party, will show the spirit in which the first Education Act was framed ; and although consistency is not a political virtue, there may be advantage in reminding the present Liberal party that in advocating religion as the most prominent factor in any new proposals for popular education, they would not be running counter to the principles underlying the initial measure.

"Our opinions," said Mr. Forster, "in religion may be different, but I think we all of us agree, the enormous majority of the country agrees, that the standard of right and wrong is based on religion ; and that when you go against religion you strike a blow against morality; and if we could solemnly by Act of Parliament tell the parents of children to be educated that religion is a subject not to be mentioned in the schools, they would suppose that we cared little about religion ourselves, and that in our opinion it were best left alone. . . . Surely the time will come when we shall find out how we can agree better on these matters, when men will find out that on the main questions of religion they agree, and that they can teach them in common to their children. Shall we cut off from the future all hope of such an agreement, and say that all those questions which regulate our conduct in life and animate our hopes for the future after death, which form for us the standard of right and wrong, shall we say that

all these are to be wholly excluded from the schools? I confess I have still in my veins the blood of my Puritan forefathers, and I wonder to hear descendants of the Puritans now talk of religion as if it were the property of any class or condition of men."

In another speech he said, "If religion is to be separated by Act of Parliament from any part of the daily life of Englishmen, much more of English children, it shall not be done by me; nor, if I can help it, by any one else."

As every one knows, the outcome of the lengthy discussion on the religious difficulty was the adoption of a clause proposed by Mr. Cowper Temple, President of the Education Union, which prohibited "the use of any catechism or formulary distinctive of a denomination" in the newly constituted Board Schools, but imposed no other restriction upon their religious teaching. It is interesting, however, to learn, as we may from Mr. Forster's life, what was the original idea of the Government, and why it was superseded. In a memorandum sent to Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Forster says—

"Our proposal that the majority should have what religious teaching it pleases, while the minority is protected, is logical and impartial in theory *and would work well in practice.* Can we not, then, carry it? Yes, with the help of the Opposition; but I fear a majority of our side of the House would vote against it. All the Radicals—not merely men like Fawcett,

but earnest supporters of the Bill like Mundella—all the Dissenters, from Baines to Richards, would find themselves forced to oppose us; and they would be followed, or rather led, into the lobby by the Whigs, by Sir George Grey and Whitbread; and all our best friends like Brand would beg us to prevent a division which would break up the party."

I should like to call attention to one other proposal of the original Bill. School Boards were empowered to grant assistance to voluntary schools in their districts, provided that all such schools, to whatever denomination they belonged, received support on equal terms. But the Birmingham party, recognizing that the British and Foreign Schools, although they were denominational and so would have profited under the proposal, could, without injury to their religious teaching, accept the Cowper-Temple clause, and merge themselves in the new Board Schools, raised once more the old cry of "No Church rates;" and Mr. Gladstone, not further to irritate the Nonconformist conscience, substituted the proposal to give denominational schools an increased grant from the exchequer.

This slight excursion into ancient history has been undertaken for the purpose of exhibiting three points in the attitude of the framers of the original Education Act: (1) That they were resolutely determined to continue the English tradition of religious education; (2) that they acknowledged the

equitableness of allowing English parents to choose the religious teaching that should be given to their children, although at the time the exigencies of party politics obliged them to abandon their convictions; (3) that they recognized that denominational schools had an equal claim upon rates with those managed by local boards, provided that the education given was satisfactory. If these three elementary principles could even now be acquiesced in by the general public, the "religious difficulty," as it is called, would speedily vanish from educational politics, and leave the field open for the introduction of much-needed reforms. I propose, therefore, to set down a few simple considerations on each of these heads.

1. We owe it, as I have said, to special good fortune—to use no stronger term—that the secularizing policy of the Dissenters was overruled in 1870. That policy relied for what principles it could boast, first, upon an exaggerated estimate of the moral influence of mere knowledge; and secondly, upon the notion that religion was too sacred a matter for a secular State to interfere with.

The first of these cherished beliefs has at last yielded, even among Dissenters, to the logic of facts. Since 1870 the experiment of an education entirely secular has been tried in France, and the results, as formulated by French economists, have not been so satisfactory as to encourage our own statesmen

to introduce the system here. It has been tried also in some of our own colonies. The present Bishop of Manchester, who had previously been Bishop of Melbourne, gave to the Church Congress at Folkestone in 1892 a carefully guarded statement of the result of this secular policy in the colony of Victoria; and his words, in view of the recent resolution of the Trades Union Congress, are worth reproducing.

"In the colony with which I am well acquainted, the Australian colony of Victoria, the education is entirely in the hands of the Government. It is drily secular, and it has swept into its net the whole population. If we except a small number of schools which with noble fidelity the Roman Catholics have maintained, there are very few schools of a denominational character which have been established to counteract the influence of the secular system. I know that if I proceed to cite the criminal statistics of the colony I shall be met with the observation, 'After all, you may be neglecting some special and very important circumstances in the colonial life.' Well, I may. I think that I have as little confidence in statistics as any of those who distrust them. But what are we to do? The secular educationalist will admit no other evidence. Therefore, we are obliged to make the best of statistics, and to do all that we can to give them their true value.

"I must say that I do not think that in this case there are many possible causes of error; for, first of all, the Government have, as I said, swept all the children into the secular schools; and secondly, the system has been long enough at work to reveal its true consequences, for it was established on the 1st of January, 1873, and thus it will have been twenty years in operation on the first day of next year. In the third place, the system has accomplished all that its most enthusiastic supporters hoped it would accomplish. It has attained a result which, as far as I know, is almost unexampled, making the Victorian people perhaps the most completely educated people of our race throughout the world. For what are the facts? Of the children of school age in the colony of Victoria 99·56 out of every 100 are being educated. That is to say, only one child of school age out of 200 is out of school. That is a most significant fact, because we were always told that as soon as secular education became universal we should see that it produced a striking effect in the diminution of crime. Therefore nobody can find fault with us if we take these gentlemen at their word, and say, 'Since secular education has become universal, we have a right to ask, has it, according to your promise, greatly diminished crime?'

"I find that the male population in this colony has increased in the last decade by less than a third

of what it was in 1880. I may just as well say that I am citing from the year-book of the colony of Victoria for 1890–91, which very recently came into my hands. In the same period the male criminals who were summarily convicted or held to bail were, in 1880, 12,469; in 1890 they were 20,189. They had increased by more than one-half. Again, if we consider the commission of more serious crimes we get a result not very dissimilar, only, alas! not in favour of secular education. There were in 1880 thirty-six persons convicted of murder and manslaughter. There were in 1890 fifty-six persons convicted. This class of criminals had thus increased by nearly two-thirds. Again, if we look at the crime of robbery with violence we find that in 1880 245 persons were convicted of that crime, and in 1890 465 were so convicted, or nearly double. That is to say, criminals have increased in number out of all proportion to the increase of the population. Secular education is universal. It was predicted that it would diminish crime. It has been totally powerless to do so. And there is this sad and most important statement to be made, that the most serious crimes are committed by the best educated criminals. I am sure that some of you must have thought in your minds as I went on reading this awful list, 'But, perhaps, after all, the criminals to whom you have referred consist of the small selvedge of the population that has not received

a complete secular education.' Alas! the results leave us no such option. They tell us that in 1880 seventy-four out of 100 criminals were able to read and write. In 1890 eighty-nine out of 100 were able to read and write. In other words, not only has the number of criminals increased, but the education of the criminals has also increased; and, as I said before, the most serious statement, perhaps, made by the Government statist of Victoria is that amongst all the criminals the best educated are those that commit the most serious offences."

The bishop goes on to add that while in 1887 the attendance at Sunday schools was 71½ per cent. of the children of school age, in 1890 it was only 39 per cent., half the children having carried out their parents' view to its logical conclusion—that what is not worth teaching is not worth learning.

In regard to the more specifically Nonconformist idea that the State may not lay profane hands upon religious education, it will be sufficient to point out that in the last thirty years the general conception of the State and its duties has, among all classes of the nation, broadened and become more socialistic; so that Liberal working men now find it impossible to believe that their hero, Mr. Bright, could ever have denounced a Factory Act. The chief theoretical hindrances, therefore, in the way of religious education in schools under State management no longer exist.

2. But the removal of these abstract objections has not everywhere resulted in a frank acknowledgment that the religion which should be taught in the State schools is the religion professed by the parents of the children. Not the least evil of the local board system must be reckoned that it brought into existence a race of educational "experts" who devised for the schools under their management a new type of universal religion, generally known as "undenominationalism;" which "universal" religion, nevertheless, assumed a new shape and a different substance with every locality;

> "If shape it might be called that shape had none
> Distinguishable in member, joint, or limb,
> Or substance might be called that shadow seemed."

The idea of such a religion was arrived at in the following manner. "Observe," said the experts, "how religious sects differ among themselves. All call themselves Christian, but all profess some tenet which the others disallow. Abstract, then, the tenets peculiar to each sect, and you will have a residuum common to all, which is the undenominational Christianity of which we are in search." To appreciate the sophistry underlying this proposal, it is, perhaps, necessary that a man should himself hold definitely some form of the Christian creed; for then he would understand that the differences between sects are usually differences respecting the precise interpretation of some doctrine or rite which is acknowledged

by all, and to which all attach a high degree of importance; so that to omit the rite or the doctrine altogether would destroy the religion. And even when the doctrine is held by one body of Christians in such an individual way that it becomes almost a peculiar doctrine, all the more is it for them the *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ;* it is the article which for them illuminates the whole faith, and indeed represents it; it is "the master-light of all their seeing," the spring of action, the match that lights the train, the electric spark that makes a new creation out of a chaos of elements. To make abstraction of that would be to leave them poor indeed. Now, the doctrinaires who advocate this *caput mortuum* of all the sects as a sound working system are precisely those who value religion, not for its truth, but for its effect as a stimulus upon conduct; and yet they do not see that it must be ineffectual for such a purpose, because it has been created by the process of eliminating the very elements which have in experience proved capable of exercising this power of stimulus.

But it may be said, "After all we are dealing with children; and the sanctions of morality which undoubtedly inhere in religious dogmas would not appeal to them, if they were taught. They would get them by heart, and think no more about them. We, at least, are preparing the ground for the after work of the churches by teaching the text of Scripture,

especially the facts of the life of Christ." One of the best pleas I have ever seen for what is called "Christian truth free from sectarian dogma," comes in an essay written in 1868 by a clergyman of some experience as an inspector of schools, the Rev. W. L. Clay. The essay is interesting as a forecast, by a competent observer, of what would be the result to Church Schools of the impending Education Act; but I refer to it now because it puts into very clear and indeed eloquent language a plea for "undenominational" religious teaching.

"In order to educate the conscience there is no method of teaching comparable to that by which God Himself taught the world—I mean the historical method. If you teach a child that he is bound to believe such and such a thing, the idea of disputing your authority never for a moment crosses his mind. But there the matter ends; there has been no spiritual education. The conscience is untouched. To reach that you must excite his interest, reverence, worship. You must not tell him what to believe, but present something in which he will spontaneously believe—or rather, some person. The child's homage, no more than the man's, can be fully evoked by abstract goodness. It needs goodness incarnate to command his worship. In a word, what the child needs to know thoroughly is the life of Christ. With every particular of that biography he should be rendered familiar. He should be taught how the

Old Testament history leads up to Christ, how the history of the Apostles and of the early Church looks back to Christ. All should be made to centre in Christ; the whole effort of the teacher should be directed to give the scholar a vivid conception of Christ. Such teaching would be a constant appeal to the conscience. Once presented to the children, Christ Himself will do the rest. He will win them, draw them; they will worship Him. For even young children can do much more than 'say prayers'—they can really worship. They will learn to connect all their thoughts of God with Jesus, and in their conscious cravings 'to be good' (and under right training such cravings come early to children), they will really appreciate and welcome the 'good news' that Jesus can and will send a Spirit like His own into those who pray for it. National School children so taught—and I have known such children so taught—will never need a dogma about the Trinity in Unity; for they believe—not profoundly, of course, but still genuinely—in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."[1]

Without entering into a discussion of "the historical method," which does not seem to have been the method employed by our Lord Himself or any of His Apostles, who taught "with authority," we should all probably agree that the kind of religious teaching here sketched is the teaching we should wish for our

[1] *Essays on Church Policy*, edited by the Rev. W. L. Clay, p. 221.

own children—a teaching neither vague nor abstract, but centred upon devotion to Christ Himself; but we should hardly agree to call it undenominational or "undogmatic;" for it could not be given by a teacher who did not himself hold the doctrines of the Apostles' Creed. There is no doubt that catechisms and formularies of all sorts may be used by bad teachers as a substitute for instruction, instead of as a summary of instruction already given, and so may be actually harmful; but the prohibition of them, which is the kernel of the "undenominational" system, must be more harmful still, because it must prevent the conscientious teacher from drawing out the truths which are implied in the Gospel story, and constitute its sole religious value. To teach from a catechism that Christ is God and must be worshipped, without any image before the mind of what Christ is, assuredly is not to teach Christianity; but it is as possible, and much more injurious, to instruct children in the details of His life without making it clear to them how that life has anything more to do with their own lives than the even more wonderful histories of Elijah and Elisha. If School Board teachers are religious men, I do not doubt for a moment that they find a way of instilling Christian faith in spite of the disadvantages of the system; but the system, nevertheless, cannot be defended. Religion cannot be taught without a creed. The question, "What think ye of Christ?" if it is raised at all, must have

an answer; and that answer involves the Christian creed. If it is not raised, there is no religion in teaching the mere details of His life. I cannot believe that Mr. Gladstone, when he accepted Mr. Cowper Temple's amendment, regarded the Apostles' Creed as among the formularies distinctive of a denomination which were forbidden; the Rev. Mr. Clay, from whom I have quoted above, although he declaims against "dogmas" with the best, expresses the hope that "unsectarian bigotry will not rob us of *that*." But unsectarianism has done so in the very large majority of Board Schools, including those under the great Boards of London, Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham.

The "undenominational" system, then, is absolutely indefensible on any ground of theory, and, indeed, its defenders are accustomed to appeal, not to theory, but to its success in practice. But that success is not everywhere conspicuous. The syllabuses of religious instruction furnished by all School Boards to the Royal Commission of 1888, and printed in the Appendix to the Final Report, are far from pleasant reading for those who still wish to think of England as a Christian country. The syllabuses of the greater Boards are generally unexceptionable from the point of view of the Bible history and the moral lessons to be based on it; but neither in them nor in the specimen examination papers annexed is there any express recognition of the fundamental articles of the

Christian faith. All one can hope is that the actual teaching goes beyond the syllabus, as it must if the teachers are themselves Christians; and we are generally assured that it does. Of the lesser Board Schools, many follow the lead of the greater Boards, but in many more we come upon evidence of every sort of anti-church and anti-religious prejudice. Exclusive of Wales, which depends largely upon Sunday schools, I counted 496 School Boards which returned themselves in 1888 as having no syllabus of religious instruction at all. There is no salvation, I willingly admit, in a syllabus; for it is quite possible for a child's religious training to be in inverse ratio to its Bible knowledge; but that the absence of a syllabus in the case of these Board Schools does not arise from any religious motive, is proved by the special resolution of the Board upon the religious question recorded in the Government return. Generally it is to the effect that the Bible shall be read for half an hour at the opening of the school, "without note or comment," an ordinance worthy of Laputa; but eclipsed by one school which orders further that the ten commandments shall be taught without comment. Sometimes the Bible may be read "*with* comment," and then the nature of the permitted comment is usually specified; in some cases the teacher is allowed to explain the meaning of words only; in others the explanation may extend to history,

geography, and grammar; in others he may draw moral lessons. At Northfleet, in Kent, it was resolved "that the Bible be read for the first half hour in the morning without comment, but if any questions be asked by the children of the master, he shall answer them *as shortly as possible.*" The Board at Killamarsh (Derby) passed a resolution "that the Bible be read in the schools *so far as is consistent with the Education Act.*" At Horning (Norfolk) the Board not only left the whole matter to the teacher's discretion, but added that they "took no interest in the subject." At Canterbury, the home of the Christian faith in England, it is ordered "that no allusions be made to the Sacraments." Yelling (Hunts.) and Sherborne (Norfolk) report that they have no religious teaching now through the press of secular subjects. At Shillington (Beds.) the schoolmaster is specially instructed "not to teach the Creed, or give any other denominational teaching;" and at Wootton, in the same county, "the children are not to be taught to bow at the name of Christ." Of more elaborate attempts to prevent the Bible from doing mischief, it will be sufficient to quote the following specimens :—

OLDHAM (*Lanc.*).—"At the opening of the school in the morning, the head teacher in each department shall lead the singing of a hymn or moral song selected from the book provided by the Board; shall repeat with the children the Lord's Prayer; and shall

read, *without note or comment*, portions of the Bible, such as may serve to enforce the lessons given, commendatory of kindness, temperance, honesty, truthfulness, industry, obedience to parents, and like virtues; and condemnatory of cruelty, intemperance, theft, falsehood, profane swearing, disobedience to parents, and like vices."

TODMORDEN (*York*).—"The morning school shall be opened in the following manner: The first four verses of the morning hymn shall be sung. The head teacher shall read a few verses from the Bible, *without note or comment* (the passages selected shall be entered in the log-book); after which he shall repeat the Lord's Prayer, in which the children may join. *These religious observances shall not occupy more than ten minutes.*"

BURSLEM (*Staff.*).—"In the schools managed by the Board, the Authorized Version of the Bible shall be read, and portions of the text selected by the principal teacher (but subject from time to time to the direction of the Board) may be committed to memory by the scholars; but the principal teacher in charge of any school for the time being shall give explanations of an historical, biographical, or geographical nature necessary for the understanding of the narrative, and may explain the modern and generally accepted meaning of any word or phrase, the sense of which has changed since the Scripture translation was made." And then, in case religion should lurk in the too

general epithets employed, they are still further defined. "The following is the definition of the terms used above: 'Historical'—pertaining to a narrative of events and facts recorded in the Bible. 'Biographical'—relating to the lives of persons recorded in the Bible. 'Geographical'—relating to a knowledge of places mentioned or referred to in the Bible."

One other grave objection to undenominationalism as a religion remains to be mentioned, that, as its name denotes, it is not a faith professed by any society. Curiously enough, it makes a boast of this, and no regulation is commoner in School Boards than that phrase in the Act which forbids teachers to attempt "to attach children to any particular denomination." But, surely, it is of the very essence of religion that it is social; and of religious teaching, that it should attach its members to a Christian society. The Church of England, it is well known, connects in its catechism the child's very name with its Church membership; and every other form of Christian faith that has been successful in attracting members, such as Methodism and the Salvation Army, has owed its success to the strong sense of solidarity that it has been able to infuse. All experience shows that it is an enormous help to individual virtue to belong to a society; and even if the pride in one's own society is mixed, as it is sometimes in the case of young and ardent spirits,

with some contempt for other societies so palpably inferior to our own, still such contempt is but skin-deep, and the *esprit de corps*, which is the larger side of the fact, braces a boy's spiritual muscles and helps to make a man of him. We hear a great deal from School Board rhetoricians about the dangers of the partisan spirit in religion, and they are undoubted; but, at the present time, the dangers of the opposite vice seem to call for even more watchfulness. I would venture to say, let a man be a good Romanist, or a good Anglican, or a good Methodist or Plymouth brother, as good and strenuous a member of his society as he can be, with a burning zeal for proselytes—if he has no zeal for proselytizing, there is a presumption that he is no true member of his society, and had better quit it for another; but do not let him affect to be an "undenominationalist," and persuade others so; for an "undenominationalist" is merely an abstraction.

The moral is that religion is best taught to children in schools belonging to the denominations. The child learns religion in a good denominational school as he does in a good denominational home; as much by silent influence as by direct instruction; and more by deeds than words. Religion wraps him round like an exhilarating atmosphere, and he breathes it with uncritical content. It so happens that for a few months, when I was six years old and recovering from an infantile complaint, I was

left in charge of an excellent dame who was mistress of a Church School in a village in Hertfordshire. In order to keep me out of mischief she put me for the time into the school; and it is pleasant to look back and recall, as I can with vividness, the feelings of a National schoolboy in the early sixties. I remember that we liked the church to which we walked up two-and-two on Sunday mornings; and liked the service, especially the Psalms and Canticles, and, indeed, everything but the sermon, to which we did not listen; but, of all things, we liked the christenings, at which it was sure to be the privilege of one of us to hold the vicar's book (unfortunately the wrong way up, but that was unavoidable) while he administered the fascinating and mysterious rite. We liked, too, the Collects that we had to learn on Sunday, some of which I still associate with the warm smell of American cloth in which our school Prayer-books were bound. And we liked the vicar, who patted our heads and was kind, and spoke in an unearthly voice, which we were quite ready to regard as heavenly—

> "And felt how awful goodness was,
> Virtue in her shape how lovely!"

I was in the school too short a time to owe to it any large amount either of teaching or discipline, but the system laid a spell upon the imagination. It taught me reverence; and one or two special

incidents have not been without their particular fruit in my after-life. The texts on the walls still flash their warning into my memory, "Swear not at all," "Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord;" and if I am not a liar and profane swearer, I should like to acknowledge a debt to those commanding texts.

Churchmen, however, will probably not want much convincing that Church Schools are the best sort of schools, and deserve every effort to maintain them. They will also be clear that the village Board School must no longer be allowed to tyrannize over their children by denying them religious teaching altogether or offering them the savourless food-substitute of undenominationalism in its various degrees of insipidity. Churchmen and Dissenters should have no difficulty in coming to terms about the village question; for the latter, awakening from their secular dream, are complaining that their children cannot get denominational instruction when the Church School is the only school in the neighbourhood; and it would be perfectly possible to make arrangement for Nonconformist teaching in Church Schools, on condition that the children of Church parents were allowed Church teaching in schools managed by a local board. One of the very few principles that in this matter of school teaching seem irrefutable is the right of parents to insist that their children, if they are taught religion at all,

shall be taught the religion they themselves profess. The difficulty of the situation begins to be felt when it is asked how this principle is to be applied to the schools under the Boards of great cities like London and Liverpool and Manchester? On the one hand, there are those who propose with a light heart that the clergy should claim admission to the schools and undertake the religious instruction themselves. Considering the fact that almost every large parish is already under-staffed, the proposal does not strike me as sagacious. And, further, it is not only impossible in practice, but mistaken in theory. In the first place, the clergyman is not a trained teacher; and in the second, the effect of separating the religious from the secular education, and giving the first to the clergyman and the other to the teacher, would not be to magnify the importance of religion, but to depreciate it; for the clergyman has no status in the eyes of the children.[1] What the teacher says is law; what the clergyman says may be gospel, but it carries no weight. It is of the first importance, therefore, that in Board Schools the religious lessons should continue to be given by the regular teacher. I am myself of opinion that the religious teaching in Church Schools also should

[1] We may illustrate from what takes place in public schools as to the teaching of foreign languages. Ideally the best system is to introduce foreign masters who know most about the subject; in practice it is usually found best to let the form-master teach them.

be given by the teacher, and that the function of the clergyman should be restricted to a regular catechizing; but I will not pursue that subject now.

What changes, then, are required in our present system of religious teaching under the greater School Boards? There are those, of course, who will insist that no changes whatever are required. I am always hearing reports as to the superiority of the Scripture teaching given in Board Schools to that given in Church Schools, and as the Board Schools can pay better salaries and secure better teachers, I am not surprised that such is the case, for it requires as much trained skill to teach Bible history well as to teach any other history. It is true, we do not maintain Church Schools in order to teach Scripture history, but to inculcate line upon line and precept upon precept the facts of the Christian faith and the consequent duties of the Christian life; and accordingly we are most concerned that our teachers should be Christian men and women. At the same time we should be glad enough to pay better salaries and so secure better teachers, if only we could. In School Boards the Church can exercise no direct influence upon the choice of teachers; but we know they are chosen with care, and we know many of them have been trained in Church Training Colleges, and would be in Church Schools if salaries were higher; so that there is no reason why the Church should not trust them with the education of such of

her children as she cannot herself make provision for in Church Schools; though the latter is, I am profoundly convinced, by far the more excellent way. I would suggest, then, that the Church, for the present distress, should not claim to teach in Board Schools by its own ministers, but should limit its demand to the removing of the present taboo from the Apostles' Creed. I do not, as I have said, believe that it was ever meant to include the Creed among "formularies distinctive of a denomination," but as the greater Boards have taken this view, the point should be cleared up. The Church certainly cannot be content with any religious teaching that excludes the definite statement of the Christian faith.

3. The third principle of which I wish to speak is equality of treatment for Church and Board Schools in regard to national funds. This principle sectarian prejudice has hitherto availed to render inoperative. I have already shown, by quotation from a memorandum of Mr. Forster's, that it was no part of the original policy of the framers of the first Education Act, to place Church Schools at a disadvantage as compared with Board Schools. It was supposed that the Treasury grant given in lieu of rates would adequately meet their needs. The all-important difference has proved to be that while the Board Schools have been able to respond to the increasing demands of the Vice-President of the Council by

simply enlarging their precept, which the ratepayers have had no power to resist, the Church Schools have only once in the thirty years been able to convince the Chancellor of the Exchequer that there was any need for an enlarged grant. Now, what reason is there in the nature of things why Churchmen and Dissenters should receive unequal treatment from the State, the Church, which is "established," and so might expect preferential treatment, being not in the better case, but in the worse? An answer that seems satisfactory to many people, is that the State cannot possibly pay for teaching any religion that is not the religion of the whole people. But to that answer there are several obvious rejoinders. The first is that for nearly forty years the State subsidized Church and Dissenting Schools alike, laying stress on the fact that it was subsidizing the teaching of religion.[1] Another is, that the State does at present pay a large part of the expenses of Church Schools, and pays through rates and taxes the whole expense of the religion taught in Board Schools, which is very far indeed from being the religion of the whole

[1] *E.g.* a Minute of the Committee of Council (September 24, 1839) says: "Their Lordships are strongly of opinion that no plan of education ought to be encouraged in which intellectual instruction is not subordinate to the regulation of the thoughts and habits of the children by the doctrines and practices of revealed religion." Even as late as 1862 Mr. Lowe managed to overcome the opposition to his "Revised Code" by urging that "the religious element underlies the whole system of Privy Council Education, and that the inspectors will continue to inspect the state of religious instruction."

people. Moreover, to these rates Churchmen are compelled to contribute, while Dissenters are compelled to contribute to Church schools through the taxes. A comprehensible principle, therefore, in the present inequality seems much to seek. What, one may ask, are the educational principles to which the State is in fact committed? It is committed, first of all, to pay for secular education, because it has made it both compulsory and free; and it is committed to the policy of allowing such secular teaching to be allied with denominational teaching in religion. It would seem to follow that the only logical course for the State to pursue in regard to its subsidies is, either to bear the whole expense both of secular and religious education in every sort of school, or else to bear the expense of secular education only, and to put the expense of religious teaching upon the particular denominations. But the objections to the latter course are obvious and fatal. It would be extraordinarily difficult to separate the cost of the religious from the secular education in Board Schools, and it would be impossible to levy it upon the various denominations. It would be far better for the State to revert to its earlier policy, and not distinguish between the religious education and the secular, but frankly bear the cost of both, since both are of consequence to it. It will not be forgotten that this very unfortunate division between the religious and secular teaching in schools dates only from Mr.

Lowe's "Revised Code" of 1862, into which it was introduced as an inevitable concomitant of his system of payment by results, because it was contended that the results of religious education could not be appraised as a fourth R. But now that this vicious system has been discredited and withdrawn, it is not too much to hope that the equally vicious division it introduced may disappear after it.

The further question, whether the cost of education should be raised by taxes or rates or both, would seem to be a question for financiers, but it has a bearing upon "the religious difficulty." The Dissenter who at present contributes to the maintenance of Church Schools through the Treasury, is satisfied with the report of H.M. Inspector that the schools are well managed; on the other hand, if he should contribute through a local rate, even a county rate, he would, it is said, for some unexplained reason, feel insufficiently represented by the inspector, and would demand a direct voice in the management, which it might be difficult, *quâ* Dissenter, to allow him. So that it would evidently save much local friction if the funds for all educational purposes were raised as taxes and not as rates.

At this point of the discussion, however, the Dissenter, accustomed to the point of view of his political organs, is apt to break in with the exclamation, "But your Church Schools are voluntary! How can you call them 'voluntary' any longer if they

are financed by the State?"[1] To which the simple answer is that the voluntariness of Church Schools is not of their essence. There was a time when all schools, those of Churchmen and Dissenters alike, were voluntary. The latter, for the most part, ceased to be voluntary soon after 1870, because they chose to acquiesce in a form of religious teaching repugnant to the principles of Churchmen; but if the State, after witnessing our struggles for thirty years, were at last to say, "Perhaps it is inconsistent in us to subject you to penalties for refusing to abjure the religion which we ourselves profess; henceforward we allow Church teaching in all schools"—is there any reason why Churchmen should stand stiffly out for the practice of voluntary subscriptions? Do they in themselves embalm a principle? Or is there any statute of limitations which should prevent our doing in 1902 what most of the British and Foreign Schools did in 1870 and the years following?

[1] This argument is not imaginary. The chapter in the Minority Report of the Commission of 1888 upon 'The Complaints of the Advocates of Denominational Schools,' signed by Mr. Lyulph Stanley, the late Dr. Dale of Birmingham, and other representative Nonconformists, is chiefly a play upon this word "voluntary," *e.g.* "As to the grievance of contributing to a system they dislike, that is inseparable from the fact that the maintenance of schools has been made a public duty charged on public funds. No man is allowed to take credit for his expenditure in private charity in diminution of the poor rate." As though the education of two millions of children in Church Schools were "voluntary" in the same sense as whether I should relieve a beggar or send him to the workhouse!

But our Dissenter will perhaps reply, "It is not so much your voluntary subscriptions that I contend for, as your voluntary management that I am jealous of. Ours we have surrendered. And do you honestly think it fair that you Churchmen should be allowed to keep your schools in your own hands—as though you were Roman Catholics or Jews—co-opt your own managers, and appoint your own teachers, while we have to submit to all the changes and chances of local and periodical election?" To which *naif* question the reply again surely is, "Why not? What injury does such voluntary management do to you or to the State? Our schools are built under trust-deeds, which specify the religious teaching to be given, the qualifications of managers, and so forth, and by them we are bound. You also have such schools, fewer indeed than you once had, but those that remain will serve to illustrate the principle. With those we, for our part, have no wish to interfere. And you wrong us if you suppose our voluntary management brings with it no special voluntary effort. There are our school buildings, which require constant repair and constant renovation to suit the æsthetic taste of H.M. Inspector as well as the ever-growing demands of the Vice-President of the Council; and we shall be eager, besides, to build schools in other places if only we are allowed, as at present we are not. This will be a great saving of expense to the community, for which we might in

reason expect your gratitude. But for the actual education we give, why should we not claim to share alike with you, and not be treated as privileged people, to be envied an occasional dole from the Treasury, while you are allowed to take whatever funds you require from the local purse?" There is no doubt, however, that if the Government brought in a Bill to co-ordinate the education in Church and Board Schools, it would exact from the Church a *quid pro quo*, just as it exacted a percentage when it made tithe rent-charge recoverable from the landlord instead of from the tenant. And the National Society is now, it is said, prepared to agree to the representation of the local authority upon the boards of management in Church Schools, provided they do not exceed in number one-third of the whole body. Many of the clergy have long been anxious to enlarge the boards of school management in country districts so as to admit representatives of the parents, chiefly with a view to quickening their interest in the subject of education; and they would be far from resenting the proposal.

But it may be asked, "What hope is there that the Church will ever be allowed, what it has so long and with so much justice claimed, an equal treatment with Board Schools in respect of funds, and a right to have its own faith taught to its own children in all the elementary schools of the country?" The first hope, though it is a cloud no bigger than a man's

hand, is contained in the fact that by the Education Bill of this present year (1901) a new educational authority has been called into being for the supervision of secondary education; and the hope is that this devolution of secondary education to a local authority is but the first instalment of the unification of the whole of the national teaching under the local control of municipal authorities, who will deal with all the questions involved, and levy rates or receive grants for all the educational work of the district. To such an authority, cognizant of local needs and elected from all parties, both Church and Board Schools would be subject, and their affairs, it may be confidently affirmed, would be regulated with less partisanship, and with a greater adaptation of ideal requirements to the sublunary laws of space and time. The second hope seems to me to lie in the general dissatisfaction with the present state of things, and the growing conviction among the Dissenters, of which an unmistakable evidence is the recent Catechism of the Free Churches, that dogma is only another name for creed, and that creed is the necessary basis of character.

THE END.

PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED, LONDON AND BECCLES.

NEW EDITION OF W. M. THACKERAY'S WORKS.

In 13 Volumes. Large crown 8vo. cloth, gilt top, 6s. each.

THE BIOGRAPHICAL EDITION OF
W. M. THACKERAY'S COMPLETE WORKS.

THIS NEW AND REVISED EDITION

COMPRISES

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL and HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED LETTERS, SKETCHES, and DRAWINGS,

Derived from the Author's Original Manuscripts and Note-Books.

AND EACH VOLUME INCLUDES A MEMOIR, IN THE FORM OF AN INTRODUCTION,

By Mrs. RICHMOND RITCHIE.

☞ **The 13 Volumes are also supplied in Set cloth binding, gilt top, price £3. 18s. 0d.**

1. **VANITY FAIR.** With 20 Full-page Illustrations, 11 Woodcuts, a Facsimile Letter, and a new Portrait.
2. **PENDENNIS.** With 20 Full-page Illustrations and 10 Woodcuts.
3. **YELLOWPLUSH PAPERS, &c.** With 24 Full-page Reproductions of Steel Plates by GEORGE CRUIKSHANK, 11 Woodcuts, and a Portrait of the Author by MACLISE.
4. **THE MEMOIRS OF BARRY LYNDON: THE FITZBOODLE PAPERS, &c.** With 16 Full-page Illustrations by J. E. MILLAIS, R.A., LUKE FILDES, A.R.A., and the Author, and 14 Woodcuts.
5. **SKETCH BOOKS:—THE PARIS SKETCH BOOK; THE IRISH SKETCH BOOK; NOTES OF A JOURNEY FROM CORNHILL TO GRAND CAIRO, &c.** With 16 Full-page Illustrations, 39 Woodcuts, and a Portrait of the Author by MACLISE.
6. **CONTRIBUTIONS TO 'PUNCH' &c.** With 20 Full-page Illustrations, 26 Woodcuts, and an Engraving of the Author from a Portrait by SAMUEL LAURENCE.
7. **THE HISTORY OF HENRY ESMOND; and THE LECTURES.** With 20 Full-page Illustrations by GEORGE DU MAURIER, F. BARNARD, and FRANK DICKSEE, R.A., and 11 Woodcuts.
8. **THE NEWCOMES.** With 20 Full-page Illustrations by RICHARD DOYLE and 11 Woodcuts.
9. **CHRISTMAS BOOKS, &c.** With 97 Full-page Illustrations, 122 Woodcuts, and a Facsimile Letter.
10. **THE VIRGINIANS.** With 20 Full-page Illustrations, 6 Woodcuts, a Photogravure, and a new Portrait.
11. **THE ADVENTURES OF PHILIP; and A SHABBY GENTEEL STORY.** With 24 Full-page Illustrations by FREDERICK WALKER and the Author, 6 Woodcuts, a Facsimile of MS., and 2 Facsimile Letters.
12. **LOVEL THE WIDOWER; ROUNDABOUT PAPERS; DENIS DUVAL, &c.** With 20 Full-page and 11 Text Illustrations by FREDERICK WALKER, A.R.A., CHARLES KEENE, and the AUTHOR, and 2 pages of MS. in facsimile.
13. **BALLADS AND MISCELLANIES.** With 35 Full-page Illustrations by the AUTHOR, GEORGE CRUIKSHANK and JOHN LEECH, 35 Woodcuts, 3 Portraits of Thackeray's Ancestors, an Engraving of the Author from a Drawing by SAMUEL LAURENCE, and a Photogravure, from a Drawing by CHINNERY, of Thackeray at the age of 3, with his Father and Mother. The volume also contains a Life of Thackeray by LESLIE STEPHEN and a Bibliography.

*** *A Prospectus of the Edition, with specimen pages, will be sent post free on application.*

London: SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 15 Waterloo Place, S.W.

PALL MALL GAZETTE.—'When the Haworth Edition was announced we expected something with which no other version has provided us, and we are not disappointed.'

In 7 Volumes. Large Crown 8vo. cloth, gilt top, 6s. each.

THE HAWORTH EDITION

OF THE

LIFE AND WORKS

OF

CHARLOTTE BRONTË

(CURRER BELL),

AND HER SISTERS

EMILY AND ANNE BRONTË

(ELLIS AND ACTON BELL).

WITH PORTRAITS AND ILLUSTRATIONS.

Including Views of places described in the Works, reproduced from Photographs specially taken for the purpose by Mr. W. R. BLAND, of Duffield, Derby, in conjunction with Mr. C. BARROW KEENE, of Derby.

Introductions to the Works are supplied by Mrs. HUMPHRY WARD,

AND

An Introduction and Notes to Mrs. Gaskell's 'Life of Charlotte Brontë' by Mr. CLEMENT K. SHORTER, the eminent Brontë authority.

CONTENTS OF THE VOLUMES:

1. **JANE EYRE.** By CHARLOTTE BRONTË. With a Photogravure Portrait of Charlotte Brontë, from a Drawing by G. RICHMOND, a Photogravure of Rochester and Jane Eyre, from a Water-colour Drawing by FREDERICK WALKER, A.R.A.; a Facsimile of the Title-page of the first edition, and 8 Full-page Illustrations.

2. **SHIRLEY.** By CHARLOTTE BRONTË. With a Facsimile of the Title-page of the first edition, and 10 Full-page Illustrations.

3. **VILLETTE.** By CHARLOTTE BRONTË. With a Photogravure Portrait of M. Heger, Facsimiles of the Title-page of the original edition and of a page of the original MS., and 8 Full-page Illustrations.

4. **THE PROFESSOR,** by CHARLOTTE BRONTË, and **POEMS,** by CHARLOTTE, EMILY, and ANNE BRONTË, and the Rev. PATRICK BRONTË, &c. With Facsimiles of the Title-pages of the first editions, and 8 Full-page Illustrations.

5. **WUTHERING HEIGHTS.** By EMILY BRONTË. **AGNES GREY.** By ANNE BRONTË. With a Preface and Biographical Notice of both Authors by CHARLOTTE BRONTË. With a Portrait of Emily Brontë, Facsimiles of the Title-pages of the first edition, and 8 full-page Illustrations.

6. **THE TENANT OF WILDFELL HALL.** By ANNE BRONTË. With a Portrait of Anne Brontë, a Facsimile of the Title-page of the first edition, and 6 Full-page Illustrations.

7. **THE LIFE OF CHARLOTTE BRONTË.** By Mrs. GASKELL. With an Introduction and Notes by CLEMENT K. SHORTER. With Photogravure Portraits of Mrs. Gaskell and of the Rev. A. B. Nicholls, a Portrait of the Rev. Patrick Brontë, 11 New Illustrations, Facsimiles of a letter by Charlotte Brontë, and of a page from Charlotte Brontë's MS. of "The Secret," &c., &c.

*** **The LIFE AND WORKS OF THE SISTERS BRONTË are also to be had in 7 vols. large crown 8vo. handsomely bound in cloth, price 5s. each; in small post 8vo. limp green cloth, or, cloth boards, gilt top, price 2s. 6d. each; and in small fcp. 8vo. bound in cloth, with gilt top, with Frontispiece to each volume, price 1s. 6d. each; or the Set, in gold-lettered cloth case, 12s. 6d.**

London: SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 15 Waterloo Place, S.W.

SMITH, ELDER, & CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

WELLINGTON'S MEN: Some Soldier-Autobiographies. [Kincaid's 'Adventures in the Rifle Brigade,' 'Rifleman Harris,' 'Anton's Military Life,' Mercer's 'Waterloo.'] Edited by W. H. FITCHETT, M.A., LL.D., Author of 'Deeds that Won the Empire,' 'Fights for the Flag,' 'How England Saved Europe,' &c. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

DAILY NEWS.—'Surfeited though we are with the "red wine of war," we are bound to say that we were unable to put the book down until we reached the last page.'

IN THE RANKS OF THE C.I.V. A Narrative and Diary of Personal Experience with the C.I.V. Battery (Hon. Artillery Company) in South Africa. By 'Driver' ERSKINE CHILDERS, Clerk in the House of Commons. THIRD IMPRESSION. With a Frontispiece. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

PUNCH.—'A series of unpremeditated pictures of campaign life invaluable for their graphic touch.'

THE GREAT BOER WAR. By A. CONAN DOYLE, Author of 'The White Company,' 'Rodney Stone,' 'The Green Flag, and other Stories of War and Sport,' &c. FIFTEENTH IMPRESSION. With Maps. Large post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

SKETCH.—'Unquestionably the most striking book the war has produced. A masterly piece of work, a real contribution to historical writing.'

A LIFETIME IN SOUTH AFRICA: Being the Recollections of the First Premier of Natal. By the Hon. Sir JOHN ROBINSON, K.C.M.G., Author of 'George Linton,' 'The Colonies and the Century,' &c. Large crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

MANCHESTER GUARDIAN.—'A weighty and interesting contribution to the thorough understanding of the most difficult of our Colonial questions.'

A TREASURY OF IRISH POETRY IN THE ENGLISH TONGUE. Edited by the Rev. STOPFORD A. BROOKE and T. W. ROLLESTON. Crown 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

TIMES.—'An authoritative and almost final collection.'

DOMESTICITIES. A little book of Household Impressions. By E. V. LUCAS. SECOND IMPRESSION. Small fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

ACADEMY.—'In these pages things to the point are said on almost every page . . . Mr. E. V. Lucas writes with knowledge and grace.'

CONFERENCES ON BOOKS AND MEN. Reprinted from the *Cornhill Magazine.* By the Author of 'Pages from a Private Diary.' Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

SPECTATOR.—'A book which every reader will enjoy.'

By the Same Author

PAGES FROM A PRIVATE DIARY. Reprinted from the *Cornhill Magazine.* FOURTH IMPRESSION. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

ATHENÆUM.—'Full of happy sayings, of stories, and of pleasant turns of observation, and amusing from cover to cover. . . . Really a model to modern writers of diaries for the public.'

SHAKESPEARE'S LIFE AND WORK: Being an Abridgment, chiefly for the Use of Students, of 'A Life of William Shakespeare.' By SIDNEY LEE, Editor of 'The Dictionary of National Biography'; Honorary Doctor of Letters in Victoria University. STUDENT'S EDITION. With a Photogravure Plate and Four Full-page Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

DAILY NEWS.—'Mr. Lee's little volume can be most confidently recommended not only to students, but to all who wish to have at hand a thoroughly trustworthy work of reference.

LORD LILFORD (THOMAS LITTLETON, FOURTH BARON), F.Z.S., President of the British Ornithologists' Union. A Memoir by his SISTER. With an Introduction by the late Bishop of LONDON. With a Portrait, 16 Full-page Illustrations, and a Facsimile Letter. Large crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

DAILY NEWS.—'Numerous fine illustrations of birds, many of them from the master-hand of Thorburn, add greatly to the charm of this pleasant volume.

London: SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 15 Waterloo Place, S.W.

SMITH, ELDER, & CO.'S PUBLICATIONS.

YEOMAN SERVICE: being the Diary of the Wife of an Imperial Yeomanry Officer during the Boer War. By the LADY MAUD ROLLESTON. With Portraits of Piet de Wet and of a group of convalescents. Large Crown 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

THE ATHENÆUM.—'Lady Maud Rolleston has written the best woman's book about the war. She does not show partiality—indeed appears to be gifted with unusual fairness. . . . On the whole, we have nothing but praise for the book.'

THE SIEGE OF THE PEKING LEGATIONS. By the Rev. ROLAND ALLEN, M.A., Chaplain to the Right Rev. C. P. SCOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop in North China; for five years Acting Chaplain to H.B.M.'s Legation in Peking. With a Map and 10 Text Plans. Large crown 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

SPECTATOR.—'Full of incident and colour, the story is as enthralling as any romance. . . . Mr. Allen's book will remain as the fullest and most vivid account of the events of last summer within the walls of Peking.'

SOUTH AFRICA A CENTURY AGO. Letters written from the Cape of Good Hope, 1797-1801. By the LADY ANNE BARNARD. Edited, with a Memoir and brief Notes, by W. H. WILKINS, F.S.A. SECOND IMPRESSION. With Portrait Frontispiece. Demy 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

PILOT.—'Delightful letters, whose shrewdness and wit and unaffected friendship make them a real addition to literature. We can make no pretence of doing them justice, because there is no passage which we can quote to which there are not twenty rivals equally good, but we recommend them to our readers in all confidence as one of the pleasantest of recent books.'

SOUTH AFRICA: PAST AND PRESENT: an Account of its History, Politics, and Native Affairs, followed by some Personal Reminiscences of African Travel during the Crisis preceding the War. By VIOLET R. MARKHAM. Large post 8vo. with Portraits and Historical Chart, *10s. 6d.*

GLOBE.—'Really a helpful work, which the student of South African politics should on no account neglect.'

SOUTH AFRICA.—'A volume which in its wealth of historical detail will prove of the utmost value.'

RODNEY STONE. New and Cheaper Illustrated Edition. By A. CONAN DOYLE, Author of 'The White Company,' 'The Great Boer War,' &c. With 8 Full-page Illustrations. Crown 8vo. *3s. 6d.*

THE WHITE COMPANY. By A. CONAN DOYLE. New and Cheaper Edition (the 23rd Edition). With 8 Full-page Illustrations. Crown 8vo. *3s. 6d.*

CLEARING HOUSES: their History, Methods, and Administration. By JAMES G. CANNON, Vice-President of the Fourth National Bank of the City of New York. With Illustrations. Demy 8vo. *10s. 6d.*

FINANCIAL TIMES.—'Mr. Cannon treats the somewhat complex subject with a fulness and knowledge which it would be difficult to surpass.'

CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE. By Professor GEORGE T. PURVES, Ph.D., D.D., of Princeton Theological Seminary. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

*** New volume of the HISTORICAL SERIES FOR BIBLE STUDENTS. Particulars of the Previous Volumes will be sent post free upon application.

HANDBOOK OF THE ADMINISTRATIONS OF GREAT BRITAIN DURING THE NINETEENTH CENTURY, 1801-1900. By FRANCIS CULLING CARR-GOMM, late of H.M. Madras Civil Service, and of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. New and Enlarged Edition. Crown 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

STANDARD.—'Most useful and carefully compiled. . . . The volume is indispensable to politicians for the purposes of reference.'

BRITISH POWER AND THOUGHT: an Historical Enquiry. By the Hon. ALBERT S. G. CANNING, Author of 'British Rule and Modern Politics,' 'History in Fact and Fiction,' &c. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

BOOKMAN.—'An able and interesting historical enquiry.'

SMITH, ELDER, & CO.'S NEW BOOKS.

NEW WORK BY THE AUTHOR OF 'COLLECTIONS AND RECOLLECTIONS.'

Immediately. Large post 8vo. *7s. 6d.* net.

AN ONLOOKER'S NOTE-BOOK. By the Author of 'Collections and Recollections.'

NEW WORK BY MRS. A. MURRAY SMITH.

Shortly. With Illustrations. Large crown 8vo.

THE ROLL-CALL OF WESTMINSTER ABBEY. By E. T. BRADLEY (Mrs. A. MURRAY SMITH), Author of 'Annals of Westminster Abbey,' &c.

THE POETICAL WORKS OF ROBERT BRIDGES. VOLUME IV. CONTENTS: Palicio—The Return of Ulysses—Notes. Small post 8vo. *6s.*

GUARDIAN.—'The new edition is as dainty a one as any poet could desire for his work, and it will no doubt win for Mr. Bridges a considerable portion of the many new readers whom he deserves.'

NEW AND CHEAPER EDITION OF F. ANSTEY'S 'LYRE AND LANCET.'

Now Ready. Crown 8vo. limp red cloth, *2s. 6d.*

LYRE AND LANCET. By F. ANSTEY, Author of 'Vice Versâ,' 'The Brass Bottle,' &c.

NEW STORY OF COLONIAL ADVENTURE.

At all Booksellers' and Libraries. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

GENTLEMAN GARNET: A Tale of Old Tasmania. By HARRY B. VOGEL, Author of 'A Maori Maid,' 'My Dear Sir,' &c.

NEW NOVEL BY MISS HOWARTH.

At all Booksellers' and Libraries. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

NORA LESTER: A Story of the South African War. By ANNA HOWARTH, Author of 'Jan: an Afrikander,' 'Sword and Assegai,' 'Katrina: a Tale of the Karoo,' &c.

NEW NOVEL BY MISS BIRRELL.

At all Booksellers' and Libraries. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

NICHOLAS HOLBROOK. By OLIVE BIRRELL, Author of 'Love in a Mist,' 'The Ambition of Judith,' &c.

A SPIRITED ROMANCE OF THE SEA.

On April 15. Crown 8vo. *6s.*

A NEW TRAFALGAR: A Tale of the Torpedo Fleet. By A. C. CURTIS.

OTHER NOVELS SHORTLY FORTHCOMING.

MY LORD WINCHENDEN. By GRAHAM HOPE, Author of 'A Cardinal and his Conscience.' Crown 8vo. *6s.* [*On April* 30.

AN INLAND FERRY. By SUSAN CHRISTIAN. Crown 8vo, *6s.* [*On May* 10.

London: SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 15 Waterloo Place, S.W.