

At length Henry became convinced that, at any cost, Thomas must be brought back to England. A hollow truce was patched up between them. The King managed to evade giving the kiss of peace to the Archbishop, as the latter earnestly wished, and as in fact it had been agreed; and Thomas landed at Sandwich on December 1, 1170.

The rest of the story we know well: how the Archbishop was met by enmity on all sides, and how his angry measures in reply provoked the hasty words of the King, which in turn led to the murder in his own Cathedral church on December 29, 1170. It would be a rash thing to describe it again after Dean Stanley's matchlessly picturesque account; but it is not necessary for our purpose to do so. Let it suffice to say that the murder of the Primate of All England in his own Cathedral not only roused universal horror, but helped men to realize that, after all, the struggle was a contest between the Church and the world. Thomas the Archbishop at once became Thomas the Saint in the estimation of all men; and as such, but for a comparatively short period, he has been regarded ever since.

We can see, no doubt, that Thomas was compassed about with many human imperfections. We can see that he jeopardized a great cause—the cause of religious liberty—by the rash and unwise means with which he endeavoured to defend it. We can see, as Gilbert did, that it might have been far wiser to give up a cause which was not really defensible and to strengthen the substance by the surrender of the shadow. And yet it is Thomas, and not Gilbert, who is counted as the saint. And it is right that this should be so, for assuredly the vital question with regard to every man is rather what he aspires to be and to do than what he attains to. And as long as we recognise that motives are greater than acts, and that what a man *is* is more than what he does, so long, assuredly, we must see that the popular discrimination is just, and that we rightly speak of the Archbishop as Saint Thomas of Canterbury.

W. E. COLLINS.

ART. II.—THE SUPPLY AND QUALIFICATIONS OF THE CLERGY.

THE New Sustentation Fund is a fresh proof of the vitality and the faith of the Church. A few years ago, when assault gathered around her, she showed no alarm, but with quiet and unobtrusive fidelity pursued her career, did her daily

work, and developed her resources. To-day, when the sharpness of assault is past, she looks to the future, and with equal steadfastness she strives to increase those endowments which have excited the cupidity or awakened the fear of her foes; and she does this with no feelings of insolent pride and for no purpose of domination or display, but simply from the conviction of duty at once to those who work and to the work which must be done.

But the Fund will speedily show other effects, and of these most people have thought but little. No more serious question can confront a Church than that of the supply and the qualifications of her clergy. We may, indeed, divide the problem, and consider the supply separately from the qualifications; but, of the two, the qualifications are infinitely the more important. The ideal clergyman for a parish is a man of refinement and culture. He has a wide knowledge of the world, and he has read much upon many subjects; he is profoundly convinced of the truth of the Christian religion, and he has thought out its difficulties for himself, and viewed its parts in their mutual relations and their due proportion; he is in sympathy with men of thought and men of action, whatever their wealth or position, and he is filled with a passionate desire to lift himself and them into a nobler condition of life; hence he feels truly and deeply. The moral and emotional parts of his nature have been as carefully cultivated as his mind and as carefully developed as his body. He is filled with admiration and with passionate love for Jesus Christ. His crowning ambition is to contribute, by the man's strength and life that are within him, something to his Master's glory and to the development and strength of His kingdom. For this reason he has a message to his fellow-men. His heart longs to deliver itself of all it feels, and his mind to deliver itself of all it knows; hence, though his lips may stammer at the first, he grows into a man of eloquence, and in the truest sense becomes an orator. He is a teacher, too, in narrower circles and less exciting circumstances, and he bears his message with him from man to man, from house to house in his parish. He gradually draws forth the best persons within that little world, and develops, trains, and strengthens the best that is in them. A moulding influence is at work, and though sin may still vex men's lives and opposition to Christ still raise its ungrateful front, the parish becomes softened, subdued, and coalesced, because of the presence and the toil of a saint of God.

Ideals are never realized, and this one is yet afar off; but it is well to look at it, and see if we cannot approach it.

In the first place, then, we need a fair prospect of indepen-

dent work for each man, after he has learnt the best methods and developed his strength as an assistant to another. The age at which the curate should be placed in charge of a parish must vary, but the date of that promotion ought not to be so distant from his ordination as to give him any leisure or interval for relaxed exertion ; neither ought it to come so late that he has grown disheartened and has crystallized in method, thought, and aim. There are many miserable years in the history of some of our best and strongest curates, when they have found themselves neglected and overlooked, and while they look out into the world of the Church and see no definite road along which they may travel to the work which they feel they can do. It is often said that men of their calling ought to work still with the zeal and ardour which marked their first years ; but they were called because they were men, and as men they are ruled by the laws of human nature. One of those laws is hope, and the hope that is deferred maketh sick the heart of the curate as much as the heart of the soldier or the barrister. The danger of crystallization is greater than that of diminished energy. George Eliot remarks that at an early period in his life Charles Dickens ceased to assimilate impressions. He wrote always of the things he had noted in his early manhood. When a clergyman has reached five-and-forty years without free and independent scope for his energy, he finds it hard or impossible to accommodate and adjust himself to the wants and circumstances of a parish which, in all probability, is essentially different from those in which he served as curate ; means familiar to himself, but created and employed for other needs, are the only ones which are likely to suggest themselves to his mind. He has been, perhaps, a preacher of power to a town congregation that has always numbered many hundreds, and he is amazed that sentiments and thoughts which moved them to tears or to generous deeds fall absolutely flat in a country congregation of fifty, where no man has read a book since his boyhood or vexed himself with any question beyond the politics or the commercial interest of the village. All the organization of the great town parish is reduced to himself and his wife. His Bible-classes, his candidates for Confirmation, his choir, the tone and beauty of his services, are successive disappointments. There are few who can see the reason at once, and still fewer who can transform themselves so far as to fit themselves into the new lives, thoughts, sympathies, and habits that are before them.

In the next place, we need some adequate funds to provide payment for the work to be done. Our three sources of income are tithe, property, and voluntary contributions, given either as weekly offerings or as payment for "sittings" in the parish

church. To the last of these there are many limitations. Seat rents would be impossible in country parishes, and they are a vanishing income in many parishes of large towns, where the wealthy residents of the past have yielded to transient lodgers, or the houses themselves have been turned into places of business. Weekly offerings are always too uncertain, and nearly always too small. In one of the most influential parishes of London, where everything depended upon them, the Vicar was recently compelled to make a strong appeal to the people to pay off a couple of hundred pounds of debt which lay upon the year's work of the church. Yet there was not a single clergyman in that parish who was adequately paid. Tithe has sunk from ten pounds of premium in the sixties to thirty-two pounds of discount in the nineties. A hundred pounds of tithe was, in other words, worth a hundred and ten pounds thirty years ago, and now it is worth but sixty-eight. Landed property, which forms the endowment of many parishes, as well as of many cathedrals, has become more of a burden than an advantage. Even within the radius of eight miles from Charing Cross the endowment of one parish has fallen in value from five pounds an acre to one pound.

The working result of this is threefold. First, we have a state of poverty amongst the clergy that is at once disgraceful and mischievous. We have 14,000 benefices in England. Nearly 400 of these vary in annual value from a *minus* quantity up to £50; 1,100 more run from £50 to £100; and 4,000 more from £100 to £200. England rightly insists upon what is roughly known as a married clergy. The advantages of such a clergy overwhelm the supposed advantages of celibacy. The total number of our clergy is 20,000. The sum total of our endowments is £5,750,000 a year. If you distribute this equally amongst all, you have £280 a year for each. But such a dead level of mediocrity would be intolerable. Large expenses are involved in extended work. No Bishop could buy bread upon that sum. One Bishop told me lately that it would be impossible for him to do his work and live if he had not private means; and his income is several thousands a year. Another, who is now dead, reckoned the annual working expenses of his diocese at £5,000. The diocese, the parish, the Bishop, and the undergraduate would all suffer, and would all reject this remedy. If you have great offices, they must be sustained, not by paraded pomp, but by circumstances consistent with themselves.

A second evil is the necessity of seeking men of private means for the offices of the Church. The cry has become painfully common that none but men of fortune may be

incumbents of certain parishes. No patron likes an impoverished vicar. Every parish desires an incumbent who can take a chief share in subscriptions and in the hospitality and social life of his neighbourhood. The choice of an incumbent is therefore to be made from a narrow circle. The poor parish is most frequently unattractive from one cause or another, and many men of means will not accept it. The circle becomes narrower yet. The question is not who is the fittest, but who will undertake the work. And when at length someone is found, he enters upon his task without the inspiring sense that he was chosen because he seemed the fittest.

A third evil is a failure in the supply of candidates for Holy Orders. The great majority of young men must depend upon their professions for their maintenance. It is right that no man should seek the ministry of the Church for the sake of payment; but no man is fit for that ministry unless he has common-sense, and no man of sense, unless he has a private income, will accept a calling which does not promise a fair wage. There is, indeed, much competition amongst young men for work, but there is also strong competition amongst various kinds of work for men. The man of ability, character, and industry finds a hundred roads open to him; from all directions voices solicit his powers. And with a faint whisper the Church of God, whose tongue used to dominate and absorb the noises of earth, implores him to think of her and her works and wants. If the young clergyman could exist upon crumbs, or if he could be a mendicant, like the mediæval friar, then all that is holiest and strongest within him would heartily respond. But we are compelled to look facts in the face: to remember the necessary solitude of parents, the life prospects and demands which modify the most eager self-sacrifice, and the heart-breaking report, too often repeated to be untrue, that many men seek admission to Orders only because they have failed in the pursuit of something else.

But over and above this, we have to face the uncertainty which most men feel of procuring independent work within reasonable time, and of moving forward in the work of the Church according to the development of their own powers and experience. The average curate has to depend upon his Bishop and his reputation. The Bishop's patronage is exceedingly limited: it is impossible for any Bishop to do what he would like for all the claimants upon his regard. Bishops of the present day cannot be accused of nepotism; they make mistakes—gross enough indeed—but they conscientiously endeavour to do their best for the highest interests of the Church. The other classes of patrons are the Deans and

Chapters of cathedrals, private persons, and the Crown. The cathedral patronage is limited by statute or by custom in such a way that Chapters can seldom make free choice from the whole Church. Private patrons have come within recent years to feel more than ever the responsibility of power, but they cannot know the brave, quiet, unobtrusive men who are bearing their Master's message and life from door to door of East End garrets or remote and unromantic villages. No one, I suppose, professes to understand the methods of the officers of the Crown. They make appointments; there is no appeal; and the matter rests. The world is silent, for amazement paralyzes utterance.

This systemless system is working irreparable wrong. It is wearing out the hearts of our young men; it is robbing the Church of invaluable energy and devotion; and it is making the public feel that neither worth nor power nor sacrifice will count in the career of a clergyman compared with luck or influence or obtrusive allegiance to some political or ecclesiastical party.

Our undergraduates and sixth-form boys pause before they embrace so huge a risk or encounter such a bitter disappointment.

Some remedies suggest themselves. The first is to raise such a Sustentation Fund all over the Church as will provide a minimum income of £200 a year to each incumbent, or, better still, to each clergyman. The fund which has been started is a happy combination of the principle of voluntary contribution with that of endowment and establishment. It owes its origin in chief measure to laymen, but it started not merely with the strongest approval of those in authority in the Church, but with the glamour and name of England's gladdest celebration. So far as public opinion goes, its permanent success is assured; but that success depends upon the extent to which it is worked in our 14,000 parishes. It is the small and steady gifts of the multitude which accumulate large sums rather than the princely gifts of the few. The Roman Catholics in Ireland know and work upon this. They are building all over the country beautiful churches and stately cathedrals. The people are nearly all poor. In the diocese of Derry a Roman priest recently demanded of a laundress £1 a year as her subscription to one of their building funds. She protested that she could not pay so much; but she was informed that nothing less would be accepted. Her reply was full of instruction: "I cannot give you a pound a year, but I will promise you *a shilling a week.*"

2. We must make some generous provision for our aged and disabled clergy. Let there be no confusion here between the

beneficed and the unbeneficed. In the present state of things many curates can never receive benefices, and many must not expect to receive employment as curates after attaining the age of forty-five or fifty. There is no sorer hardship than this. The British army pays its officers badly enough, but when a man becomes superannuated at fifty he is given a pension which will, at any rate, support him. The aged curate is given nothing. The Archbishop of Canterbury has recently written that ~~it~~ in the direction of pensions we must look for the relief of unbeneficed curates.

3. The amalgamation of small and scantily-populated parishes will effect a further improvement. Take an illustration: Two parishes lie together. One has a population of, say, 120, and the other a population of, say, 200. For these 320 souls there are two clergymen, two churches, two rectories, and four services at least every Sunday. The distance between the two churches is two miles. The incomes of the two parishes are £120 and £140. Now, neither parish provides sufficient income or sufficient work for the incumbent. It is, humanly speaking, impossible to produce so strong an effect and to exercise such strong influence for good, or to teach either in the pulpit or the houses of the people with such earnestness, as if the numbers were four or five times as large. Time must hang heavily upon the hands of men who are burdened with such a meagre and yet such a difficult task; but if the two parishes were united, and services were held in the churches alternately, and the double income given to one man, and the least desirable house rented or sold, the spiritual improvement, as well as the temporal, would be enormous.

4. Some reform in patronage is absolutely necessary. There is, as we said above, abundant and convincing evidence that patrons of all kinds act with an earnest and honest desire to appoint the fittest men they know; but in present circumstances it is impossible for public patrons, or for private, to take any general review of the clergy. Their sources of information are scanty, and their own range of observation affords but slender means of accurate acquaintance with the qualifications of either rectors or curates. Accident does as much in many appointments as judgment. Hundreds upon hundreds of men who would adorn the highest offices are unnoticed because they are undiscovered.

And it is hard to find a universal remedy. Some which have been suggested would cure one evil by creating another. The election of an incumbent by the communicants or the ratepayers must be rejected at once. The system of the Irish Church was carefully, most carefully, prepared, and it was expected to work smoothly and effectively. It created a board

of patronage for every parish, which consisted of the Bishop, three nominators for the diocese, chosen every three years by the Diocesan Synod, and three for the parish, chosen at the same intervals by the vestry. Thus, the Bishop was represented, the diocese, and the parish. Nothing, apparently, could be more perfect. And yet these boards were not ten years at work until there rose all over the Church loud cries of dissatisfaction. The parochial element became too powerful, and demanded that its choice should be ratified by the other members. Men of the highest character and ability were overlooked, because more showy or more noisy men had caught the fancy of the parish; and one of the Irish Bishops, who has closely watched the working of these boards from the beginning, confessed to me a few months ago that they were a failure. What he would substitute is a small board of patronage for every diocese, without any representation from the parish that may be vacant.

In this country patronage is one of the chief privileges of the Crown, and in private hands it is an article of marketable value. The Bishops would naturally be loath to surrender the only means of rewarding men who have done, and will do, good work, and similar feelings would be aroused amongst Chapters and in the Universities.

But, over and above these, without touching any of their rights, or in the slightest degree limiting their liberty, we might create diocesan registries of reference and information, where the names of the best men in the diocese might, without any motion of their own, be recorded by the Bishop, or by any other person whose recommendation might be trusted; and this register should contain the names not only of young men who are capable of administering parishes, but of older men who are fit for the highest work in the Church. The special qualification of each man would be attached to his name; a record, full and accurate, would be made of the work he has done. Care would be taken that the record should be correct and complete. The register would be open to all patrons, and to it all would be invited to refer.

And we might go further than this. It would not be difficult to create a board of advice and reference, consisting of such persons as the Patronage Secretary of the Treasury, the Patronage Secretary to the Lord Chancellor, the Bishop of the diocese, or one of his suffragans, and four or five clergymen and laymen appointed by the Diocesan Conference or nominated by the Bishop. We should by this method have an opportunity of knowing the good men, and the Church would enjoy the conviction that all appointments are made after the fullest consideration and upon the completest knowledge.

5. This would give such confidence to young men and their parents that we should in a few years find a considerable increase in the number of candidates for ordination. With a sufficient stipend and a fair prospect of independent work, and the promise that the very highest offices would be open to merit, and to merit alone, the very ablest graduates from the Universities would seek Holy Orders. The standard of examination would be gradually raised, until no one would be admitted without the fullest proof of knowledge, of power to preach to large audiences and to small, to deal individually with men, and to adorn by their private lives the Gospel they proclaim. We could give more time to the preparation of the candidate after he has taken his degree, and we should soon remove the objection of many laymen, that they know more about philosophy, theology, the Bible, and the world than the man does who professes to teach them every week. So far as we can see, the progress of Christianity in this land depends upon the ability of the clergy to preach in the church, to persuade men in private, and to live lives of nobleness and truth.

WILLIAM MURDOCK JOHNSTON.



ART. III.—THE HOPE OF ISRAEL.

PART II.

IN the last number I dealt with the direct predictions of a king Messiah, son of David, and the recognition they receive in early Jewish literature. I need not show here at length how in such works as the Sibyllines, the Psalter of Solomon, and the "Assumptio Mosis" this Scriptural expectation of a Davidic king is blended (and rightly) with that other cycle of inspired utterance which foretells the great "theophany," or manifestation of Jehovah's world-wide rule (*cf.* such Psalms as xciii., xciv.-c.). In this literature, we know, the Messianic hope is frequently distorted. But the Scriptural exegesis which lay behind the wild dreams of material conquest and the like is at least unassailable. The very vagaries of such literature (which was never deemed authoritative) corroborate the confession that the age of inspired prophecy had passed.

But it is to the Scriptures that all in the New Testament at least make appeal for their ideal of Messiah. And this leads me to another direct prediction. Why is it that we read that people who did not know the incidents of Jesus' birth reasoned