necessitous parish have its own labour home, then let all the parish priests stretch out their hands and take hold of each other, and they can with confidence inquire, what part of this great country is untouched? Surely no better Institution can be offered for this purpose than the provincial, diocesan, ruridecanal, and parochial Constitution of the Church of England.

On the first 100 cases, 26 were received from various and responsible persons, and 74 were selected by a working-men's committee on their own application. Of these, 43 obtained permanent situations, 3 were restored to friends, 10 were passed on to convalescent homes and infirmaries, 8 had the usual permission to go out and look for work and did not return, 11 were dismissed for drunkenness, 7 for idleness, 1 for theft, leaving 17 promising cases in the central Labour Home.

The average age of admission was 33 years, and the average length of training for each man 53 days. The Church Army will be quite within their province, therefore, to claim at least 50 per cent. as successful cases amongst those who have come under their treatment. This success they regard as another triumph in the name of God and His Church, and they lay at His feet all the glory.

One or two communications, which may be of interest if incorporated here, have recently been received. Thus the honorary secretary of an important London branch of the Charity Organization Society writes: "I feel that we are giving you a great deal of trouble, but yours is the only agency to which we can confidently refer such cases." The chairman of one of the London Boards of Guardians says: "The Guardians voted your organization a grant of £5. . . . And they recognise the value of religious influences being brought to bear on the men." Surely this is another evidence that our National Church is becoming, in the highest and best sense, "a National provident institution for mutual life insurance."

W. H. Hunt
(Secretary of the Social Work of the Church Army).

---

Art. IV.—FURTHER MATERIALS FOR THE HISTORY OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.


It is some time since we reviewed Mr. Wilfred Ward's book, and endeavoured to assign to his father, W. G. Ward, his proper place in the movement which has had such effect upon the history of the Church of England. Since the death of
Cardinal Newman and Dean Church two very important additions have been made towards the complete narrative, which we hope some day may be executed by an impartial and judicious historian. The time has hardly arrived for a complete survey of the ground, and at the present moment, perhaps, the general reader may be of the opinion that the "Ten Years' Conflict"—to borrow a phrase, or rather a title, in the "Church History of Scotland"—has been a little too much before the public. Mr. Meyrick has already drawn attention to some points in the discussion which has originated in the publication of Cardinal Newman's letters, and we do not intend to say more upon the character of that remarkable book than to express surprise that the intense self-consciousness of the revelation made by Newman should have been so little dwelt upon by the many critics, who have really almost exhausted the language of panegyric in pronouncing their verdicts as to his character and fame. The power of Newman as a writer of sermons and an extraordinary judge of human character can hardly be exaggerated. But it is somewhat strange to see how completely the magnetic influence which he exercised in old days still exerts its magic spell over minds of the highest class. His vacillations, his shifts, and, we must add in fairness, his extreme diplomacy in controversy, are all forgotten, and the injury he inflicted on the many minds he led captive is condoned from an overweening admiration of certain attractive personal qualities. We shall have more to say on this subject when we come to deal particularly with Dean Church's character-sketches. It is enough to say that, while the letters of the Cardinal ought to be carefully read, it is necessary to bear closely in mind the elucidations to be drawn from the late Sir William Palmer's important volume, a book which has never yet received the full attention it deserves.

Very few men have ever occupied a position like Dean Church. Many years ago some of his Oxford friends asked his permission to collect from reviews some of the papers which are known to be his, and the result was the volume of "Essays and Reviews," now scarce, containing some of the best writings of the Dean's. The essay on Dante, the sketch of Anselm's history, and the dissection of Audin's "Leo the Tenth" are in their various ways quite admirable. The essay on Montaigne, originally published in the "Oxford Essays," is also of first-rate excellence. There are few passages in modern criticism more discriminating than the judgment he passes on the whole character of Montaigne's mind, and the withering scorn with which he notes his moral blemishes. High, however, as
the opinion entertained by Dean Church’s friends was as to his merits as an historical critic and a true judge of poetry, that opinion was heightened when the modest volume containing his first four University sermons was given to the world. There have been many sermons on the life and character of our Lord of true merit and great beauty; but Dean Church stands alone in his wonderful portraiture of the Central Figure of the Gospels, and he has shown completely in that volume, as well as in the others which followed from time to time, how grand and absorbing was his grasp of the whole scope and nature of revelation. Like his friend J. B. Mozley, he has gathered from his master, Bishop Butler, an intense feeling of the inadequacy of all attempts to estimate the final issues of the great conflict waged in the world. He has dwelt, too, on the progressive character of the moral and spiritual truths of the Bible with a power and distinction which are quite peculiar, and exercise the strongest fascination which an admirably expressive style can enforce. The sermon on “Sin and Judgment,” dealing with a question now exercising much the thoughts specially of the young, can hardly be over-praised as a statement of the mind of Scripture and the meaning of our Lord’s words upon the great issues of life and conduct.

When Mr. Church was drawn from the retirement he loved so well to the deanery which had been filled by Copleston, Milman, and Mansel, those who knew him best felt that in the fourth representative of the University of Oxford in that deanery, there would be no diminution of power or culture. We shall not allude to the vexed questions which arose in the course of Dean Church’s tenure of office, except to express a regret that one who was a lover of peace should in any way have been connected with a disturbing strife, which might, we think, have been easily averted. It had been known for some time that Dean Church intended to write upon the “Oxford Movement.” Everyone who reads the fragment of a letter to Lord Acton, which concludes the advertisement of the “Oxford Movement,” will feel how thoroughly the Dean’s words reflect and express the real uprightness of his nature. He had an honest belief, to use his own words, that “the men of the movement, with all their imperfect equipment and their mistakes, were the salt of their generation.” Due respect must be paid to the expression of such motives as these, but admiration for the highest personal qualities is not inconsistent with the possession of strong partisan feeling; and there are traces in the volume of a lingering love of the excitement of a contest. When the tournament is over, and the esquire of a knight tells the tale of struggle, it is perhaps too much to expect that he should be able to do justice to all the combatants. Dean
Church endeavours, we believe, to be impartial, but we cannot think he always succeeds. We shall enumerate three topics on which we think there is still much to be said.

In the first chapter of the book, where the Dean gives an account of the Church in the Reform days, we consider his statement of the position of what is called the Evangelical Party as inadequate, and in some respects misleading. It is perfectly true, as the Dean says, that "the austere spirit of Newton and Thomas Scott had between 1820 and 1830 given way a good deal to the influence of increasing popularity." But the immense effect of the revival of personal religion, and the general improvement evidenced in missionary exertion and increased philanthropy during that period deserve fuller recognition. Divines of Dean Church's temperament forget that intellectual excellence was disparaged, if not contemned, by the leaders of Evangelical opinions; and it is a great mistake to suppose that, because the religious literature of the day was often one-sided and insignificant, there were not men, both among clergy and laity, who were leading the noblest of lives, and despising, as fully as John Keble and Isaac Williams did, professional rewards and intellectual distinction. In the Dean's account of the religious impressions of his time there is a failure, as it seems to us, to realize the existence of the deepest spiritual life among those who may have had imperfect conceptions of Church organization and a meagre acquaintance with some of the masterpieces of English theology. Independently working at this time, in a spirit of loyal fidelity to the Reformation settlement, there were men like Edward Bickersteth and Henry Venn Elliott, who were ready to hail revival of daily service and weekly communion, increased order and fervour in worship, without sacrificing any distinctive principle which they prized. Indeed, part of this chapter seems to have been written in entire forgetfulness of the extent of the influence exercised by preachers like Blunt and Bradley, Daniel Wilson, and the Noels. The truth is that the extraordinary success of the revival of what we may call the corporate view of religious life made its followers sometimes incapable of seeing the real depth and earnestness of the original Evangelical movement.

Again, although the account of the Hampden controversy is upon the whole most interesting and instructive, we wish greatly that before the Dean wrote his final estimate of Hampden as a divine he had reperused the remarkable pamphlet of Archdeacon Hare, written at the time of Dr. Hampden's elevation to the episcopate, and exposing certainly some very unfair treatment of the famous Bampton Lectures. We have no wish to revive a forgotten controversy. Dr. Hampden was a man who had no magnetic power of attracting
disciples or friends. The Whig Ministry made a grave mistake in appointing him to his professorship and to the See of Hereford, but we think it quite impossible to accept fully the Dean's statement that the famous elucidations represent, "as fairly as any adverse statement can represent, the subject of its attack." We are not at all afraid of the effect produced on any fair-minded reader by a perusal of the "Elucidations" and the letter to the Dean of Chichester in 1848, which may be found by the curious in such controversies in the volume of "Miscellaneous Pamphlets," by Archdeacon Hare, collected after his death in 1855.

The last ground of difference which we have with Dean Church, is his severe treatment of the Heads of Houses at Oxford. We think the Dean entirely underrates the intense excitement in the country at large. A strong Romeward tendency had shown itself. There was a movement within the movement. Gross exaggeration no doubt prevailed. Most men were incapable of seeing that men like Keble and Pusey were not likely to leave their moorings, and that Ward and Oakeley were pressing on towards a position utterly inconsistent with loyalty to the English Church. What were, as Mr. Simcox asks in the Academy, the poor Heads of Houses to do? It was hardly to be expected that every step they took should have been safeguarded. It was hardly to be expected that they should have been able to sympathize with ardent spirits and to restrain excesses. It must be remembered, too, that at the very moment when the somewhat harsh and old-fashioned methods of repression were adopted, the disgraceful secessions to Rome, which have not yet ceased, and which are the everlasting opprobrium of a movement that has so much to recommend it, had commenced. At the present time it is impossible to read some of the articles in the British Critic without a feeling of amazement that such utterances could have been made by men who retained their position in the English Church. It was a time, moreover, of cruel suspicion and ill-natured gossip. But can people wonder that grave divines like Dr. Hawkins were alarmed when they learnt that Romish ecclesiastics were in communication with resident Fellows. Dean Church says that it is not agreeable to recall these long extinct animosities, but we think he has hardly done justice to the intense feeling excited by the disloyalty of these extremists. We remember well that after a strong and manly sermon of Dr. Christopher Wordsworth's in Westminster Abbey, in which he dealt severe blows at the strange position assumed by Mr. Ward and some of his friends, an eminent lawyer, the dear friend of many of the Oxford leaders, said in our hearing, "That was a severe sermon, but I cannot say it was undeserved."
We have now said all that we mean to say in the way of fault-finding. The book is a most interesting one. Some may regret that the writer of the “Christian Year” did in his later days cease to be the poet of the Church at large, and seemed to shrink into the dimensions of a partisan poet and divine. But all who love high-souled devotion and real force of character will dwell with intense admiration on Dean Church’s admirable sketch of his character and life. It is a beautiful picture of a soul devoted to the highest views of life and religion, and in this and in all other sketches of character to be found in this volume there is distinct evidence of the Dean’s keen appreciation of all that is attractive and lovely in ministerial life. His account of Charles Marriott is a delightful supplement to what Dean Burgon has told us of that most interesting man, and the whole story of Newman’s rise and progress—alas! that we should have to add of his decline and fall—is delineated by the Dean with a fidelity and grace almost unexampled. It is always difficult for a disciple who has owed much to a master to put his finger upon blemishes and yet retain a loving and kindly spirit. But the Dean has done this, and we now see clearly how Newman shifted his ground, grew discontented with what the great controversialist divines had urged, found out as he believed a *via media* which he trusted would sustain his steps, and at last fell back upon a mere makeshift likeness of his position to that of Elijah and Elisha—a position which fell like a house of cards when the panic of insecurity had settled upon his soul. Delicately and feelingly the Dean retraces the sad history of an eventful period, and he does not scruple to declare in an independent spirit the effect of the unsettlement that was produced by the desertion of leaders from whom very different guidance was expected. The late Dean of Westminster, who had a most sincere regard for the character of his brother Dean of St. Paul’s, was in the habit of calling him the most upright of men, and the pages in which the Dean speaks of the effect produced by Froude’s “Remains,” Pusey’s “Tract on Baptism,” and the less famous ones of Keble and Williams, are a standing proof of Dean Stanley’s keen judgment. It must have cost Dean Church much to assume the grave, judicial tone in which he discusses “the unfortunate and unnecessary turn to things” given by these publications, and when he describes with great delicacy what we must call the inaccurate presentation of Newman’s position, given in the “Apologia,” we cannot help feeling that the Dean has dealt with a most difficult mental problem in the spirit of a real lover of truth.

It is always delightful to dwell upon the agreement on great matters to be found in the writings of those who are contending
for great principles; and those who are familiar with the three very remarkable ordination sermons which are contained in Dean Church’s volume, called “Human Life and its Conditions,” will dwell upon the evidence they give of the great and comprehensive view which the Dean took in latter years, of the English Church and her ministry. We give a beautiful passage for which our readers will thank us: “We all of us know that there are loud voices abroad in the world, and, alas! calm and grave ones too, calling us, in the name of Truth, to give up the one guiding light of the world. In the name of Truth we must follow where Truth leads us; but in the name of Truth do not let us, bowing before an intellectual tendency which is the accident of a time, be false to our deepest, most irresistible convictions, to our most solid, obstinate assurances, both of mind and heart. Let us remember that the love of Truth, like anything else, may turn into an idol and a snare; that self-will can unconsciously substitute itself for it, and that a scornful contempt of what is public and common can transform itself into that ‘angel of light.’ Let us not commit the folly and crime of quailing and being cowed because clever men of the world go about pronouncing that all is uncertain. Let us meet them, let us pay our debt to them, by thinking as we ought to think—not talking, but thinking—of our great trust and ministry. Be among great thoughts of what you have and are called to; think of what you inherit; think of all that you come after and how the Gospel you preach has made good its words. It is only when we sink to low and mean thoughts of the greatest of ministries, that the words and sophistries of this world have their power and wound. No, we are not dreamers, we have the rock under our feet when we declare that in Christ crucified is the salvation and hope of the world.”

There is much to be said as to the relations between the discomfited remnant of Newman’s friends, the younger Liberal Party, and those who followed Sir William Palmer at the time when the English Review was called into existence. But it may be more fitting to deal with this subject when we consider in detail the very interesting and important Life of Archbishop Tait which has just been published. At the present moment there is a strong desire for peace and comprehension within the province of the English Church. On looking back on the two great movements, the Evangelical Revival and the Oxford History, it is impossible to forget that another movement in the direction of a freer criticism of sacred documents has been steadily advancing, and is now making itself manifest in minds and places where its influence was hardly suspected. The future of the English Church, its cohesion, and even its
continuance, must depend greatly upon the sagacity and temper of her rulers. If a modus vivendi can be found, it will be through the instrumentality of men who can bring to the consideration of deep subjects the noble temper, the firm faith, and the manly and inspiring eloquence of Dean Church.

G. D. Boyle.

Art. V.—Systematic Almsgiving.

Almsgiving to be efficacious, that is, to benefit both the giver and the recipient, must be systematic. Spasmodic, indiscriminating charity is no credit to the donor, and probably harms those on whom it is bestowed. Charity to be real must involve some self-denial that the element of sacrifice be not wanting and some consideration that the alms be wisely bestowed. Charity born of the emotions, put in force by a sudden impulse, is merely the indulgence of a kindly feeling, not the fulfilment of a sacred duty. I would be the last to check charity in any form; Treasurers of charitable institutions cannot afford to refuse help given from any motive; but there might be more frequent and definite teaching and exhortation on the duty of almsgiving than there is, as a rule, within the pale of the Established Church. There is frequent begging for this object or that, but that is not teaching; there is sometimes scolding because the congregation refuses to respond to appeals, but that is not teaching—I mean teaching in the abstract, exhortation and persuasion, a plain setting forth of the primary duty proving our love to Christ by some self-denial for His cause, some measure of obedience to His command, “Love one another.” We members of an endowed Church do not feel the necessity as others do of contributing daily to maintain our Church, and so, in many cases, almsgiving is dissociated from the Church itself, and has degenerated into a formal contribution of the smallest coins at hand to collections too infrequently made. This is not always so; there are churches in our communion whose almsgiving bears comparison with the most generous of congregations on a voluntary footing, but it is so too often and it ought not so to be. Congregations will probably resent teaching on this point more than on any other, but still the plain enunciation of the duty should not be neglected. No duty is more clearly laid down with more definite instructions in the New Testament than this. Let every one (not the rich only, but every one), on the first day of the week (i.e., systematically) lay by him in store (i.e., deliberately and thoughtfully), as God hath