LXX. and its many corruptions. How nobly the P.B.V., spite of its inevitable imperfections, stands out in contrast! To any open-minded scholar in this twentieth century the long-lasting grip of the dead hand of the Latin must seem amazing. Of course, to an educated Romanist who dares to defy the prohibitions of his Church there are the original Hebrew and Greek, and he knows of the existence of our own A.V. and R.V. as translations of them, the study of which would show him how much he can learn from them which the Vulgate cannot teach. Yet to some of the races of Europe even this forlorn hope is not an available one. For example, not until the year of grace 1897 did Breton-speaking Christians get the chance of reading the Word of God in a translation from the original tongues, and even then, it need not be said, it was not by the action of the Roman Church, but by the labours of the Protestant pastor Lecoat.

R. SINKER.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. III.—THE POSITION AND POWER OF THE LAITY IN THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

THE wide and interesting discussion during recent years of the question of autonomy in the Church of England has naturally called attention to the conditions under which other Episcopalian Churches are governed. The papers (and to a still greater extent the debate which followed) on the subject at the Church Congress, held at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, in September of last year, gave prominence to this point—the measure of autonomy enjoyed by the Church in the United States and in the Colonies. Some interesting particulars were given, especially with reference to the Church in Canada and Australia; but these were necessarily of a general character, and no attempt was made to describe in detail the methods adopted for the maintenance of discipline, or for internal administration in the churches referred to. The point most strongly brought out was the fact that in each case the laity bore their share of the burden of government. The exact position allotted to them, the precise amount of responsibility undertaken by them, was not made plain, and many Church people at home are looking forward to learning more on these points from the further discussion of the question of "autonomy," which, it is announced, will take place at the Brighton Church Congress, now so near at hand.

In the meantime it may prove not uninteresting to glance

briefly at the position occupied by the laity in the councils of the Scottish Episcopal Church. It is, of course, essentially a self-governing Church. The State does not recognise it; the titles of its dignitaries are mere courtesy titles, and it looks in vain for any aid from public funds even for its schools. It has to fight its own battle, and so far it has managed to do so with very fair success. Its small "population" of 125,000 is almost lost in the sea of Presbyterianism which surrounds it, and the comparatively numerous body of clergy (over 300) in charge of "parishes" are fully occupied in tending flocks scattered over vast tracts of country. In nearly every respect there is greater likeness to the Church in the Colonies than to the great Church across the Border. And in government the similarity is maintained. Until about a quarter of a century ago the condition of the Scottish Episcopal Church, from an administrative point of view, was somewhat chaotic. There was an almost total want of organization, and Bishops, clergy, and laity, each in their own particular province, acted without reference to, and often with little consideration for, one another. The laity were autocrats in the congregation, but had little influence in the councils of the Church. The institution, in 1876, of a governing body, termed the "Representative Church Council," changed all this. It is true that this Council deals with nothing beyond the finances of the Church, but in this, as in many other instances, the control of finance gives the key to the situation, and in some respects the Representative Church Council is the most powerful factor in Scottish Episcopal Church Government. Further powers are given to the laity under certain of the Canons of the Church, a Code which also dates from the year 1876; but it is in the Church Council that laymen are given the opportunity, if they have the will, to make their influence widely felt. With certain noteworthy exceptions, it may be confidently stated that they do not take full advantage of this opportunity. There is probably not the same apathy with regard to Church affairs in Scotland as in England, but it is only on very rare occasions that one meets with a layman who has even the most elementary knowledge of the internal working of the administration of his Church, and this remark applies to office-bearers as well as to the ordinary and generally uninterested Church members. This suggests a difficulty which will have to be reckoned with in formulating any scheme of self-government for the Church of England. The ignorance which obtains amongst all classes of society on all matters of Church government will only be removed by years of persistent labour on the part of those,

clergy and laity alike, who are really and truly interested in the welfare of their Church.

Writing as a member of the Church of England long resident in Scotland, I should say that, while there is not the same apathy with regard to Church questions amongst Scottish Episcopalians as may fairly be laid to the charge of their brethren across the Border, there is, considering that they are members of a small community struggling for existence in an unsympathetic atmosphere, a woeful amount of ignorance where one would expect to find intelligent knowledge. In England the laity of the Church allow themselves to be put to shame by the systematic and business-like manner in which members of the Nonconformist bodies manage their church affairs. In Scotland the genius for administration which so distinguishes the race is liberally drawn upon by Presbyterians for the perfecting of the organization under which their churches are administered. The elder or deacon of a Scottish Presbyterian Church is almost too well informed on every point touching its discipline and government, and it may safely be assumed that the representative to the General Assembly (a synod held annually, in May, in Edinburgh) will have an intelligent appreciation of every subject likely to arise for discussion.

At the same time, it must be conceded that a marked improvement has taken place during recent years in the interest manifested by Scottish Episcopalians in Church work. An authority on the subject[1] was able recently to announce that it was interesting to note the "great influence which the Representative Church Council has had on the welfare of the Church in Scotland since it was called into existence nearly a quarter of a century ago. By giving the laity an equal voice with the clergy in all that relates to the practical management of her affairs, those in authority in the Scottish Episcopal Church have shown that her ancient and Scriptural system of government is not inconsistent with the democratic sentiments of the Scottish people, and have thus taken out of the way part, at least, of the old opposition to Episcopacy—that it is oligarchical and absolute in government. It is to be hoped that the early years of this century will see a further extension of the same principle in the direction of permitting laymen to share with the clergy the responsibility of carrying through whatever legislative schemes may be deemed advisable in order to adapt the organization of the Church to the varying needs of the times." This tribute to the satisfactory work accomplished by the Church Council is probably well de-

[1] The editor of the "Scottish Episcopal Church Year-Book."

served, but I am inclined to think that the success claimed for the organization has been achieved by the energy and business capacity of a comparatively small section of the members of the Council rather than the intelligent interest of a majority of the representatives.

It is not easy to ascertain with any degree of definiteness the precise position occupied by the laity in the Church, and the extent of their power varies greatly in different congregations. This want of uniformity arises from the fact that in nearly every case the individual church has its own constitution, differing perhaps (although often on some point of minor importance) from the rest. This constitution dates in many instances from the foundation of the particular incumbency, originating probably at a time when the Church had no central authority, and was maintaining what appeared then to be an almost hopeless struggle for existence. Thus it comes about that the power of the laity is in some respects more apparent than real, in others more real than apparent. This statement will best be made clear by a short outline of the varying conditions under which laymen exercise such power as they possess. They exercise it both in connection with the government of the Church, and also (and to a far greater extent) in the management of the Church's finances.

1. *Government.*—Under this head may be considered, for convenience' sake, the part which the laity are permitted to take in the election of Bishops and clergy. The seven Bishops of the Church are elected by the clergy and lay electors, who are called together, upon a vacancy occurring, by a special mandate from the Primus. The Primus is elected by his brother Bishops, and it is interesting to note that only a few weeks ago the Bishop of Moray, Ross, and Caithness (the Right Reverend James Butler Knill Kelly, D.D.) was elected Primus in succession to the aged Bishop of Brechin (the Most Reverend Hugh Willoughby Jermyn, D.D.), who has been the chief pastor of the Scottish Episcopal Church since 1886, but felt called upon to resign owing to advancing years and failing health. Practically all the clergy doing duty in the diocese have the right to vote in the election of a Bishop. The lay electors above referred to are the congregational representatives, and must be male communicants of not less than twenty-four years of age. They are appointed by the franchise of the male communicants of the congregation of not less than twenty-one years of age, hold office for three years, and are eligible for re-election. One lay elector is appointed to represent each incumbency or mission charge. They derive their power from Canon IV. of the Church's Code of Canons, and act only on the occasion of the election

of a Bishop. In that election they have no power of nomination, and they vote in a separate chamber from the clergy. The nomination takes place in the presence of the whole of the electors, but must come from the clerical side. It is competent for any elector to address the meeting in regard to the nomination made. For the purpose of voting the two chambers are then formed, and in order to secure election a majority in favour of the nominee must be recorded in both chambers. Failing this double majority, the Canon provides that the meeting may either proceed to take another vote for the same or another person, or may adjourn from time to time; and should no appointment be made by the expiration of six months from the issue of the mandate, the right of election falls into the hands of the Episcopal Synod—*i.e.*, the Bishops of the Church. It will thus be seen that, while the laity have no power of nomination in the election to the Episcopate, they have the power to block the way should a candidate not congenial to them be proposed. In the election of the clergy they occupy a totally different and very much stronger position, but here their power varies in different congregations. The constitution of the majority of the incumbencies confers upon the Vestry all the prerogatives of a close corporation. They nominate and elect their own clergyman. He is chosen by them, and remains at their pleasure. In the words of Canon XIII.: "When the Pastoral Charge of any church becomes vacant, the right of presentation shall be exercised by the person or persons in whom the said right is vested by the constitution of the said church, or whose right of patronage has been established to the satisfaction of the Bishop of the diocese. If any dispute arise as to the person or persons in whom the right of presentation is vested, the question shall be determined by the Bishop of the diocese, subject to an appeal to the Episcopal Synod, provided that in all cases wherein the Bishop of the diocese is one of the parties in such dispute, the question shall go direct to the Episcopal Synod." The right of presentation is in many cases vested in the Bishop of the diocese, in other cases in trustees, in others in private individuals, in several in a combined patronage of Bishop and trustees or Bishop and Vestry; but the Vestry (as elected by the congregation) is by far the most powerful elective agency within the Church, and is often called upon to undertake a task of much delicacy and no little responsibility. It is euphemistically stated that "Charges are raised to incumbencies by the Bishop in his Diocesan Synod after the application from the congregation has been considered," but the fact remains that the power of veto with which the Bishop is vested is exercised upon

only very rare occasions. I do not remember a single instance of a Bishop refusing to install an incumbent chosen by the congregation through their representatives the members of the Vestry. I can call to mind the case of an incumbency to which three nominations have been made within less than ten years, and the congregation in question seem quite determined not to settle down until they meet with a pastor after their own heart. Whether this is for the good of the Church or not is not so apparent, and is a question that I am not at the present moment concerned with; but the fact remains that in certain cases the power possessed by the laity is a very real power, and that they do not hesitate to exercise it. It is, however, not a general power, enjoyed by every member of the Church who may be elected by the congregation to the position of church manager (as the members of the Vestry are termed), but extends only to those cases where the Church managers have the right of presentation to the incumbency. In one church a manager may have very extensive powers and serious responsibility; in another his influence is as restricted as that of the English churchwarden. In more than a half of the 189 incumbencies of the Church, the right of presentation rests with the Vestry or other representatives of the congregation, and the qualification of the congregational power to be found occasionally in the Church's Year-Book in such announcements as "Patrons: The Vestry, with the consent of the Bishop"; or "The Vestry, with the Bishop as adviser"; or "The Vestry, the Bishop sitting as a member of the Vestry for this purpose," merely serves to accentuate the fact that the lay position in the matter of the election of pastors is, where it obtains at all, a very strong one.

For the purposes of the general administration of the secular affairs of the Church (apart from finance, which will be dealt with separately), the laity are entitled to at least an equal voice with the clergy. Here, again, the practice varies under the differing conditions of the constitutions of the various churches; but, speaking generally, the church managers (or Vestry) are responsible for the proper maintenance of the fabric of the church and rectory, the arrangements for seating are in their hands, and the appointment of organist rests with them. In every case it has clearly been the aim of the framers of these statutes or constitutions to relieve the clergy as far as possible from the trouble and worry of purely business matters, leaving them free to give their whole attention to the conduct of the services of the Church and their ministerial duties generally. And to the laity also is given a large share in the management of the Church's schools. Seventy-three day-schools are maintained by the Scottish

Episcopal Church, and more than 13,000 scholars receive their education under Episcopalian masters and mistresses, who are subject to the control of a governing body of school managers. These committees are differently constituted in different dioceses, but in nearly every case there is at least one lay member for each clerical member. They do good work, without any assistance from the State or from the rates beyond the grant given to all elementary schools, and it is satisfactory to be able to record a steadily increasing number of scholars and a standard of education (as shown by the reports of the Government Inspector) equal, in most cases, to that of the rate-aided Board Schools.

It will thus be seen, I think, that the measure of autonomy conceded to the laity in matters of local administration in the Episcopal Church in Scotland is considerable. The weak point lies in the fact that it is not uniform. The election to incumbencies by direct congregational vote exists but in few cases; but the Church managers, with whom, as has been shown, patronage rests in so many cases, are elected by the popular vote (and as a rule have to be re-elected every third year), and may in most cases be trusted to make choice of a pastor who will be acceptable to the majority of the congregation. The Bishops, on the other hand, where the selection is left entirely to them, naturally, in nearly every instance, select men of their own school of thought, without reference to the predilections of the particular congregation concerned.

Beyond the powers already referred to, members of the Church who are communicants are entitled[1] to attend the meetings of the Diocesan Synod (consisting of the Bishop and beneficed clergy of the diocese), and to address the synod upon the subject which may happen to be under discussion, but not to vote. They may also be licensed by the Bishop, as lay-readers and catechists,[2] to read the Common Prayer and Holy Scriptures at such places within the diocese as he may deem expedient. And, further, a layman may under special circumstances be permitted by the Bishop, at the request of any rector or priest in charge, to address a congregation in the church.[3]

In connection with the government of the cathedral churches, the constitution also varies in different dioceses. In the case of an existing church appointed a cathedral, the existing constitution remains in force, and it would appear that in such a case the appointment of the cathedral clergy rests with the church managers if the patronage of the charge vests in them. In the case of the erection and institution of

---

[1] Canon XXX. [2] Canon XLIII. [3] Canon XIX.

a new cathedral, however, the Bishop becomes the head of the cathedral,[1] and the appointment of the Provost (as the rector of the cathedral church is termed) and other clergy rests with him. The Dean of the diocese is not necessarily connected with the cathedral; his charge may be at the other end of the diocese, but he is always a member of the Chapter. The more modern cathedrals (*i.e.*, instituted since 1876) are governed in accordance with a code of statutes approved by the Bishop and the Diocesan Synod, but no layman has any voice in the administration of these statutes. The general management of the financial affairs of the cathedral is, however, usually vested by a separate constitution in a congregational committee consisting of the Provost and precentor, acting *ex-officio*, and a dozen laymen, eight being elected by the popular vote and four afterwards appointed by the Provost. This committee not only deals with financial affairs, but has the power of nominating the organist, choir-master, choir, vergers, and any other laymen engaged in the service of the Church. In connection with Cathedral administration, there has recently arisen a case of much interest as illustrating the conditions of government obtaining in the Scottish Episcopal Church. The Provost of a cathedral (and Dean of the diocese), finding himself unable to see eye to eye with his Bishop, felt called upon to resign his Provostship, in order, as he expressed it from the pulpit, that the cathedral might become, as in the days of the primitive Church, the Bishop's own church. A congregation in the same diocese, the majority of whom were in sympathy with the views of the ex-Provost on Church questions generally, at once invited him to become their pastor, the incumbency having recently become vacant, and he was elected to the charge by the unanimous vote of the church managers, and was soon afterwards installed by the Bishop for whose comfort in matters ecclesiastical he had shown so much consideration. Everything was conducted amicably, and all concerned remain good friends. The instance is probably unique, but goes to prove, I think, that the freedom of a Free Church has some advantages, and that the power of patronage is at least sometimes in good hands when it is vested in the congregation.

The position and power of the laity thus far defined has relation almost exclusively to questions of local autonomy. It is, as will be seen, considerable, but a varying quantity. In matters of discipline pure and simple the laity have no voice; the Primus and Bishops hold undisputed sway. It is difficult to see how it could well be otherwise. The value

[1] Canon IX.

of the Episcopacy as an organization lies in the strength and supremity of the ruling power, within the limits to which the Church as a whole resolves that that power shall extend. In the most delicate questions of discipline the authority must rest with the chief pastor. It behoves the laity, therefore, to appreciate and use with the greatest care the power given to them in the election of their Bishops. But it is in questions connected with the finances of the Church that the position of the laity in the Scottish Episcopal Church is best defined, and here the power conceded to them is not only real, but has universal application.

2. *Finance.*—The financial affairs of the Church are in the hands of the Representative Church Council. This Council consists of the Bishops, all instituted and licensed Presbyters, diocesan officials, and a lay representative from each incumbency and licensed mission in the Church. The function of the Council is to be the organ of the Church in all matters of financial administration; to take cognisance of the whole financial affairs of the Church; to have custody of all the corporate funds of the Church (so far as committed to it); and to collect and distribute money for all Church purposes of a general or corporate character (as distinguished from those which are strictly congregational or diocesan), but does not deal with questions of doctrine or worship, nor with matters of discipline save to give effect to canonical sentences of the Church. The Council meets annually in one of the large towns of Scotland, but the work is carried on throughout the year by an Executive Committee, and by Boards having the control, respectively, of the Clergy Sustentation Fund, Home Missions, Education, and Foreign Missions, all of which hold frequent meetings at the central offices of the Council in Edinburgh. The lay representatives are elected by the cathedral and church congregations at an annual meeting held for the purpose. Owing to each misson being entitled to send a representative, the number of laymen on the Council is slightly in excess of the number of clergy. On the Executive Committee the laity preponderate in the proportion of about two laymen to one clergyman, but on the Boards dealing with Education and Missions the clergy have the majority. A reference to the report of the Council for the current year shows that nearly all the members of these committees, both clerical and lay, attend the meetings with exemplary regularity, and it may fairly be claimed for the Council that since its inception a great advance has been made in the administration of the financial affairs of the Church. How far this success is due to the excellent work done by the permanent officials at the central offices it is not

easy to judge, but to them and to a small body of enthusiastic members of the Church resident in Edinburgh much must be ascribed. The Council, however, is almost entirely dependent upon the congregation for supplies, and here again it is to the local organization and energy that we must look if we wish to discover what opportunities of usefulness the laity enjoy, and whether they use them well. One of the chief duties of the Vestry or congregational committee is to collect contributions to the Clergy Sustentation Fund. These contributions usually take the place of pew-rents, and in a well-organized congregation the district (corresponding to the English parish, but topographically embracing a great many parishes) is divided into several "wards," for one of which each member of committee is responsible. The actual work of collection is carried out by lady members of the congregation, who report to the member of committee who has charge of their ward. In small districts the whole of the work is often done by the secretary to the Vestry; but in a self-supporting Church the Clergy Fund is necessarily of the highest importance, and in no field has the Representative Church Council done such good work as in the effective organization of the means for dealing satisfactorily with the Church's requirements in this direction. The collections for the other central funds are made in church at the discretion of the incumbent. The division of the Clergy Fund is made on the equal dividend principle, each incumbency being allotted the same amount.

The laity are also represented (to the extent of one representative from each congregation, with a few additional members) on the Diocesan Council, of which the Bishop and all the clergy are members, which meets twice a year for the purpose of dealing with questions of diocesan finance.

Those who are seeking for the Church of England a measure of autonomy, which will give the laity of that Church a position of much greater responsibility than they now possess, will probably not see much that is attractive in the limited power enjoyed by their Episcopalian brethren in Scotland. In the Scottish Episcopal Church the statutory government of the affairs of the Church at large rests with (1) The Episcopal Synod, consisting of the Bishops and dealing with appeals and with accusations against Bishops. The laity have no voice here. (2) The Provincial Synod, called together only on rare occasions, and consisting of the Bishops (who form the First Chamber), and the Deans and a proportion of the clergy specially elected by the Diocesan Synod (who form the Second Chamber). The Provincial Synod has the sole power of legislating for the Church by the enactment or amendment

of canons. The laity have no voice here. (3) The Representative Church Council, the constitution of which has already been fully explained. Here the laity have at least an equal voice with the clergy. They have as large a share in the control of the finances of the Church as their clerical brethren, they have an equal voice in the election of Bishops, and they possess the right of presentation in the case of the majority of the incumbencies.

Compared with the Church of England the Episcopal Church in Scotland may be described as possessing complete autonomy, for it is entirely self-governing. No man of alien religion has the right to legislate for its members, but this has been so only since 1864, the date of the Act removing the disabilities affecting the Bishops and clergy of the "Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland." Since then it has been a free Church, and has made some use of its freedom. It has much yet to learn—much ignorance within its walls and without to contend with—and, as in England, it will probably depend upon the combined and continuous effort of clergy and laity united in the bond of one community of purpose, whether or not it be proved in the future that there is nothing in the principle of Episcopacy opposed to the attainment of the highest perfection of order and good government.

Briefly, then, the layman in the Scottish Episcopal Church who takes an intelligent interest in the Church's work, and is not afraid to accept responsibility, has certain opportunities for usefulness denied to the layman in the Church of England. It would be idle to say that he appreciates these opportunities at their full value, or even that, in the great majority of cases, he understands that they are open to him. The average layman is as little versed in Scotland as in England in the principles of government ruling the administration of his Church's affairs. There is a widespread indifference in lay circles to all matters connected with organization, whether relating to the Church, the diocese, or the congregation, and a lamentable lack of interest in such questions is manifested by all but a very small minority of the members of the Church. Membership of the different committees is rather avoided than sought after, and the attendance at Synod and Council is not what it should be. In this and other respects the laity of the Church in Scotland differ in only a very slight degree from their Episcopalian brethren in England. As a rule, little interest is taken in the election of office-bearers, and there is little or no competition for the honour of representing the congregation as lay elector or lay representative. The question of Church administration is rarely referred to from the pulpit,

although there seems no reason why the clergy should not occasionally endeavour by some means to make their congregations understand the position of the laity in the Church's scheme of government. It could at least do no harm, and would remove one of the arguments frequently used by laymen when the work of any of the Church's committees is brought to their notice—that they have never heard of it before! There are, of course, many men in the Scottish Episcopal Church, as in all churches, who devote much of their time and energy to work connected with their Church's affairs. They constitute a comparatively small army of working bees in a hive of drones, and to them is due the credit of having carried to a successful issue the various schemes of which I have endeavoured to give an outline. As I have, I trust, shown, such men share in the responsibility of the election of Bishops and clergy, they help to manage the day-schools of the Church, and they have more than an equal voice with the clergy in the control of financial affairs. It is true that their franchise does not extend to interference with the fundamental laws of the Church, and most people will be inclined to think that, under present conditions, it is as well so. Some day, in both England and Scotland, the laity may be aroused to a fuller appreciation of their position and its natural responsibilities. For the present it must be acknowledged that even as the great mass of the laity lack the enthusiasm of purpose necessary to good work, so do they lack the knowledge of Church history and government, without which their efforts would be of little use.

H. D. HENDERSON.

ART. IV.—ASIA IN EAST LONDON.

SOME sixty years ago a few supporters of the Church Missionary Society discovered, to their sorrow, that while missonaries were being sent to Asia, not only was nothing being done for the many Asiatic seamen who visited this country, but that the treatment which they received in the East of London was a disgrace to civilization. In consequence of the complaints made by these and other people, the secretaries of the Missionary Societies in London discussed the matter at their monthly conference, and decided to see for themselves if the state of the Asiatics was as bad as it was represented. To their surprise, they found it was worse.

For they discovered that these strangers on coming ashore with money in their pockets were met by rascally