

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

## Reviews.

*Moore's Church Manuals : Church and Chapel Series.* 1. *State Control over Church and Chapel*; 2. *Church and Chapel Property*; 3. *Parliamentary Grants to Church and Chapel.* London: Walter Smith. 1887.

WE welcome the appearance of these three new manuals, which, with a former publication, the "Established Church Question: How to deal with it," as a fourth volume, have lately appeared in a series of uniform size and price. They have been published at an opportune time. For the Liberation Society, as Mr. Moore warns us, "are making arrangements for an energetic autumn and winter campaign," in order to be prepared for "another General Election, or for any event which may suddenly make Disestablishment the most pressing question of the hour." Their lecturers, it is true, have been so mauled by Church Defence speakers, such as Mr. Helm, that they are somewhat shy of appearing in public. And so now there is to be a change of tactics. "Special pains are to be taken," so the committee of the Society states, "to ensure the discussion of the subject in Liberal associations, clubs, and other political organizations. Young men's improvement societies and local parliaments furnish similar facilities for the advocacy of the society's views—facilities which will," they hope, "be used with watchfulness and practical skill." It is evident that if Churchmen are to hand on to future generations the heritage which they have received from the liberality of their fathers, they must not fall asleep in the presence of so watchful a foe. Every Churchman, whether of the clergy or laity, should make himself well acquainted with the history, position, and work of that branch of the Catholic Church in which the providence of God has placed him. And it is not enough to be well read in general Church history or even in that of the English Church. He should be instructed in the special fallacies and half-truths and misstatements with which such books as the "Radical Programme" and the "Case for Disestablishment" abound. Manuals like those we are considering are exceedingly useful for this end, Mr. Moore having, as is well known, for many years made Liberationist questions and literature a special study of his life. We hope that they may be largely read. With their assistance some instructive lectures might be prepared for delivery before audiences both in town and country. And it is very important that this should be done in order to clear away some of the mass of ignorance which prevails on Church history among both Churchmen and Dissenters. It has been found that rural deaneries are the most convenient area for organizing Church Defence. But it is impossible to expect that the parent society in London should be constantly providing lecturers for every locality, especially in the country districts. If, however, three or four persons could be found in every deanery who would make themselves responsible each for one instructive subject in Church history, and be ready to deliver this in any parish where it might be asked for, great interest might be awakened, and much information given on the history, position, and past and present work of the Church of England. If these are once well and fairly placed before the country, we have no fear of Disestablishment. It is only ignorance on the part of those who should know better which will ever bring this about.

In his first volume Mr. Moore returns to the question raised on a former occasion in his "Dead Hand in the Free Churches of Dissent":

Can these religious bodies in any true sense be said to be free from control of the State? Is it possible for the Liberation Society to fulfil its promise of gaining liberty for the Church by bringing about its Disestablishment and Disendowment? How completely the fallacy of this position has been proved by the book in question is shown by the admission of the *Christian World* of April 23, 1885: "It would, we think, be surprising if any candid reader failed to be convinced of the truth of the writer's contention—that Dissenters who incorporate doctrinal creeds in their trust-deeds come under the control of the State, not merely in a civil, but also in an ecclesiastical sense, and to an extent that is wholly inconsistent with their boast of perfect religious liberty." "A real service," it goes on to say, "will have been rendered to Nonconformists if they take heed to his words and cease to defend an indefensible position. At present the 'dead hand' is a heavy affliction upon living men, and often a sore hindrance to spiritual work." This very unpalatable conclusion naturally has found many antagonists, and Mr. Moore has in this volume replied to the arguments of Dr. Dale, Mr. Guinness Rogers, and the Liberation Society which were called forth by his former work. The question may be very briefly put. A chapel is raised by voluntary contributions, and the building given over to trustees. The promoters of the undertaking are free to select any doctrines they may please to be taught in the chapel and incorporated in the trust-deed. But there their liberty comes to an end. Should a recalcitrant member of the congregation object to the sermons of the minister as not being in accordance with the official creed of the chapel, he may bring the matter into court. The judge will demand to see the deed. The one question he will ask is, "Has the doctrine prescribed in the deed been taught by the minister?" It will matter nothing at all whether the doctrine in question is antiquated and no longer held by the Connexion, whether the minister's preaching and manner of life is acceptable to the great majority of his flock. If he has not rigorously observed the directions of the deed and preached doctrines which perhaps neither he nor a single member of the congregation believes, out he must go, and find a livelihood elsewhere. His congregation may follow him to a new chapel, but nothing can get them out of the clutch of the "dead hand" which drew up the deed but a special Act of Parliament passed in their favour. This is so real and pressing a difficulty that the officials often keep the trust-deed belonging to a chapel under lock and key in order to prevent awkward questions being asked; and ministers, when appointed to a pastorate, are known to display a discreet absence of inquisitiveness on the same subject. How real a difficulty this may be was shown by the passing of the Dissenters' Chapels' Act of 1844, after the adverse decision of the courts in the "Lady Hewley" case. A large number of Presbyterian congregations had in course of time become Unitarian, and all of these might have been ousted from their chapels but for the relief and protection afforded them by the Act in question.

What is the character of some of these trust-deeds may be shown by the following words of the late Congregational minister, the well-known Mr. Baldwin Brown: "I have for a quarter of a century been preaching "at Clayland's Chapel under a deed which I suggested, which simply puts "the building in trust for the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the "Son of God, by such ministers as the Church, in the mode duly set forth, "may from time to time appoint. It was hard work to get the deed "accepted. The chapel had been purchased by the then London Congregational Chapel Building Society. It was their property, and they "sent the draft of a deed containing, I think, all the doctrines, not only "which Calvin propounded, but of which he ever dreamed. It was a

"fearful and wonderful trust-deed. I refused to preach under it. The committee said I must. . . . Finding that I was firm, they at length gave way, and the deed was drawn up in the terms I have described."

The consideration of the foregoing facts will enable us to judge how far the Liberation Society are in a position to "liberate" us from State control if only we will submit to Disestablishment and Disendowment. We should be in a worse position with regard to the State than we are now. For the interpretation of the trust-deeds under which any property of the Church would in future be held we should have to go, not to our own Church Courts as before, but directly to the State Courts, our own Church Courts having been abolished. And no alteration, amendment, or addition could, under any change of circumstances, be made in the deed without the express authority of Parliament.

The light thus thrown by Mr. Moore on the tenure of Dissenting property may give rise to some very awkward and embarrassing considerations hereafter. "When the public come to understand," he says, "that in the name and professedly for the interests of religion, not only are thousands of trust-deeds being ignored by the very men who hold pecuniary benefits under them, but that a vast amount of property is being deliberately and illegally alienated from its original and legal use, they will undoubtedly have something to say on the subject. The Charity Commissioners might make their voice heard upon this growingly grave question . . . . were it not for the State-conceded privilege granted to Dissenters . . . . which exempts Dissenting places of worship . . . . from the control of the Commissioners. But why they should be thus exempted by special State privilege, and by virtue of an Act of Parliament, it is difficult to say. If Dissenting charitable trusts are thus exempted from the control of the Charity Commissioners, why should not Church and general charitable trusts be exempted also?"

But Parliament, it may be said, never will interfere with the affairs of religious bodies outside the Church. True, Parliament shows no such disposition at present. "But suppose," says Mr. Moore, "men of no religion—opposed to all forms of religion—as the representatives of public opinion, got the upper hand in Parliament—what then? Where then would be the security of religious bodies from initiative State interference with their affairs?"

In his second volume the author deals with the popular fallacy that as the State gave the Church her property and endowments, it has absolute ownership in them, and may resume ownership of them when or how it pleases. He traces the process by which the Church first acquired her property—from the free gifts of converts to the faith. He sketches the building of our cathedrals and parish churches, and the founding of monasteries, formerly the great missionary centres whence the Gospel message went forth to the heathen of this and other countries, as was notably the case with the great Monastery of Iona, the spiritual parent of Scotland, and of the Northern and Midland Counties of England, to say nothing of its influence upon Germany and other Continental countries. He next sketches the origin and growth of tithes, showing that they were a voluntary offering on the part of the laity, which soon became a standing custom and part of the common law of the kingdom. "In not one of the statutes on tithes is there a single clause purporting to be the provision under which and by which tithes were created. Their previous existence is always assumed." After explaining the Commutation Act of 1836, he discusses the question whether any portion of the tithe was ever legally assigned to the support of the poor in England. Not a trace of this can be found; the assertion of the Liberation Society that they ever had a legal share of tithe is shown to be absolutely unfounded. How,

then, were the indigent poor supported before there was a poor law in England? "Monasteries and other religious houses were built and endowed in order that they might be, amongst other good things, centres throughout the country for the maintenance of 'sick and feeble men,' for 'almsgiving and other charitable deeds.' And when in process of time it became the custom to withdraw the tithes in certain cases from parishes, and give them to religious houses, an Act was passed (15 Rich. II., cap. 6) that a 'convenient sum of money' should be paid yearly by the monastery to the poor parishioners of the parishes in which the tithes arose, 'in aid of their living and sustenance for ever;' and, also, that a vicar be 'well and sufficiently endowed' to perform the religious duties of the parish. All this provision for the poor was torn from them by Henry VIII. at the Dissolution of the monasteries, and after many years of suffering and high-handed attempts on the part of Government to put down vagrancy by force (hundreds of poor wretches are said to have been hanged for begging), it was found necessary in Elizabeth's time to pass the first poor law.

Some two and a half millions of tithe still remain in the hands of the Church. It has been lately proposed to confiscate these for the support of the poor, or for giving gratuitous education to the labouring classes. Mr. Moore thus criticises these proposals: "It is a sum of simple arithmetic; eight millions [would be required] for the relief of the poor, and twelve millions for free or gratuitous education—twenty millions in all—how far would two millions and a half of tithe and lands, in lieu of tithes and other property of the Church, go to meet this, even if all were taken from the Church, without a single penny of compensation to her bishops and clergy? Common-sense will give the answer."

It has been claimed for the holders of Chapel property, that no inquiry even may be made into the character and extent of it, because Dissenting bodies are "in the nature of private societies." Mr. Moore discusses the justice of this claim. He shows that this property is not held under a private trust, for (1) it is not independent of the sanction and control of the State; (2) the members can obtain the benefit of the trust only by conformity to a certain creed; (3) the property is exempted from rates and taxes, as is never the case with private property; in fact that Chapel property is held just like Church property, under a public trust for limited religious uses. If, therefore, it is right and proper that the Church should be stripped of its property by the State, it must be right and proper that Chapel property should share the same fate, more especially as a very large amount of it has been illegally diverted from its original uses.

The third volume of the series relates the story of the various Parliamentary grants made from time to time to Church and Chapel, and in so doing gives information which may probably be new to many of our readers. Thus it is explained how the sites of the 89 churches in the City of London, destroyed by the Great Fire of 1666, with their churchyards and parsonages, were by Act of Parliament (19 Charles II., cap. 3) vested in the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, who were thus allowed to retain, without giving adequate compensation, such land as might be required for laying out new streets, etc. Only 51 out of the 89 were rebuilt. A charge, it is true, of one shilling per chaldron was laid upon all coals coming into the port of London, and the money thus raised was applied to rebuilding these churches; this was, however, but a sorry exchange for the valuable sites thus lost for ever to the Church. The origin of Queen Anne's Bounty is also explained, a restitution of the whole of the first, and a tenth part of each succeeding, year's income of

certain benefices which had been seized by Henry VIII. This fund, aided by a grant from Parliament in 1809, is employed in improving the incomes of poor benefices, and building houses of residence upon them. An account is further given of the working of the Ecclesiastical Commission, by which, in 1884, over four millions had been drawn forth from private benevolence, and 5,000 parishes had been benefited to the amount of £891,000 per annum.

Mr. Moore makes an interesting calculation as to the sums owing to the Church by the State on account of the sites of the City churches, the first-fruits, the tenths, the tithes, the monastic lands and buildings seized by Henry VIII., and he brings up the grand total to 978 millions sterling, without counting anything for interest. In return for all this the State has at various times, as he relates, out of its princely generosity, presented the Church with the magnificent sum of £2,600,000. Dissenters, on the other hand, though they have never suffered any loss from the State, received, between the years 1722 and 1851, nearly half a million more than the Church. There can be no mistake about the facts, as Mr. Moore reprints Parliamentary returns bearing them out. It was only in 1852 that, owing to the persistent pressure put upon Government by the Liberation Society, the annual grant to Dissenters was withdrawn, Mr. Miall and his friends considering that thus their hands would be more free to carry on their crusade against what, with a sublime indifference to the facts of history, they are pleased to term "State Endowments."

We now take leave of these useful and instructive little manuals. Some of the results arrived at by them are curious. Dissenters are fond of pointing out the differences of opinion among Churchmen, and arguing thence that the clergy cannot honestly hold the various formularies and articles of the Church. Dissenters themselves are found to have departed so widely from the doctrines contained in the trust-deeds under which they hold their chapels and endowments, that they do not dare to let their trust-deeds be seen. Dissenters boast of their freedom from State control; by the confession of some of their most eminent ministers they are themselves "more miserably bound" than the Church in the shackles of the State. The Liberation Society urges the confiscation of all Church endowments, as being "national property;" Dissenting endowments are shown to be of the same character as those of the Church, and to be held under similar trusts. Dissenters try to prove, against the evidence of history, that tithes were given by the State and not by the liberality of the Church's own members; they are themselves shown on unmistakable evidence to have received more in the way of State grants than the Church. We commend these facts to the careful consideration of the Liberation Society. Their own hands should be clean before they set their neighbours' affairs in order.

J. W. NUTT.

*The Berwick Hymnal.* Edited by the Rev. A. W. OXFORD, M.A., Vicar of St. Luke's, Berwick Street, Soho. T. Fisher Unwin.

Of this Hymnal—of its character and design—we knew nothing when we began to look it through. The third hymn is Bishop Ken's "Awake, my soul;" but the last verse runs thus:

Praise God, from Whom all blessings flow;  
Praise Him, all creatures here below;  
Angels and saints His name adore  
With praise and joy for evermore.

At first, as we noticed this, we could hardly believe our eyes: we looked at it, and looked again; but so it is. Instead of the hallowed lines—

Praise Him above, ye heavenly host ;  
Praise Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,

appears a flat and pointless novelty. Naturally, we searched for other hymns in which, as the authors left them, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity is plainly taught. The alteration in the third hymn might, after all, we charitably reasoned, be one of those mistakes which *hymn-improvers* are rather apt to make. Mr. Oxford, according to the title-page, is a benefited clergyman, and on an all-important point a Hymn Book prepared by him "for his congregation" must contain the doctrine of the Church of England. We examined, therefore, several hymns in which a reference to the "holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity" might be counted upon. Some portion of the result of our inquiry we lay before our readers.

Hymn 11, with the name *F. W. Faber* printed at the end, opens thus :

O Father, bless us ere we go.

This is Mr. Oxford's : Mr. Faber's, as everybody knows, is—

Sweet Saviour, bless us ere we go.

Instead of "O gentle Jesu, be our light," Mr. Oxford gives, "Father of spirits, be our light."

In the Evening Hymn Mr. Oxford's doxology appears, as in the Morning Hymn, instead of Bishop Ken's. From Hymn 23, "Abide with me," Mr. Lyte's references to the Lord Jesus have been excluded. Instead of the author's "Hold then Thy Cross," we find, "Hold Thou the Cross ;" and we look in vain for the verse containing the line—

But as Thou dwell'st with Thy disciples, Lord.

At the foot of Hymn 29, we notice the words *G. Thring, alt.* ; and a foot-note shows the significance of *alt.* Mr. Thring wrote :

Lead us, O Christ, Thou Living Way,  
Safe home at last.

Mr. Oxford altered thus :

Lead us through Christ, the living way,  
Home, Lord, at last.

But he prints "*G. Thring, alt.*," and he gives a note, as we have said. Whether the foot-note has a history of its own we cannot tell.

This "*alt.*" ought to have been added to other hymns, the doctrinal basis of which has been changed by Mr. Oxford ; a large number of hymns. We notice, *e.g.*, that Dr. Bonar's beautiful hymn, "A few more years . . ." is not printed as he wrote it. The chorus verse runs thus (B.H. 400) :

Then, O my God, prepare  
My soul for that great day ;  
*Oh come and dwell within my heart,*  
And take my sins away.

The line we give in italics is Mr. Oxford's (instead of "O wash me in Thy precious blood"), and instead of "my Lord" he gives "my God." The significance of such alterations is unmistakable. Again Mr. Dix's "Come unto Me, ye weary" (according to "Hymns Ancient and Modern"), concludes thus :

Of love so free and boundless,  
To come, dear Lord, to Thee.

But the editor of this Hymnal, rejecting the idea of coming to the Lord Jesus, ruthlessly maims the conclusion, and prints :

Of love so free and boundless,  
To come to God with Thee.

Charles Wesley's noble Christmas hymn (B.H. 45) is mutilated and mangled. Two verses only of the five are given ; and of course that verse which opens, "Christ, by highest Heaven adored," is *not* one of the two chosen. Instead of "God and sinners reconciled," Mr. Oxford prints—

Cometh with the holy Child ;

and instead of "the *heavenly* Prince of Peace" and "the *Sun* of righteousness," he gives—

Hail, the *holy* Prince of Peace !  
Hail, the *Son* of Righteousness !

Could anything be more unwarrantable ?

Dean Milman's "Jesu, [or, "Gracious"] Son of Mary, hear," has been altered into "Jesu, Son of *Man*, be near ;" and the last two lines of the hymn actually appear thus :

When we pray—"Our Father, hear"—  
Jesu, Son of Man, be near.

Among the Easter hymns appears "Jesus Christ is risen to-day ;" but in the place of

Who did once upon the cross  
Suffer to redeem our loss,

the "Berwick Hymnal" has—

Lately on the Cross undone,  
Now his victory is won ;

and instead of "Unto Christ our heavenly King," has "Unto *God* . . ." Other characteristic changes have been made. Again, the fine hymn, "The day of Resurrection" (St. John of Damascus ; tr. Neale<sup>1</sup>), a precious treasure, states the Easter doctrine of the Church Catholic ; but it does not appear in the "Berwick Hymnal." Among the Easter hymns' however, we noticed one containing the well-known lines—

The Passover of gladness,  
The Passover of God ;

and we looked at the hymn again. It begins—

Come, sing with holy gladness,  
High alleluias sing ;  
Lift up your hearts and voices  
With new-awakened spring.

But instead of "The *day* of Resurrection, Earth, *tell* it out abroad," Mr. Oxford prints—

The time of resurrection,  
Earth sings it all abroad ;

and instead of "From death to life eternal . . . Our Christ hath brought us over with hymns of victory," Mr. Oxford prints—

The sign of life eternal  
Is writ on earth and sky :  
The Hope for ever vernal  
Of Life the victory.

No author's name is appended to this precious production !

Bishop Heber's hymn, "Holy, Holy, Holy ! Lord God Almighty," is

<sup>1</sup> Another hymn, tr. Neale, "The strain upraise . . ." has been cruelly treated by the editor of the B.H. Instead of "The Son and Spirit we adore," he prints, "One God and Father we adore."

treated in the same spirit as Bishop Ken's. Bishop Heber's line in the first and last verse—

God in Three Persons, Blessed Trinity,  
has been rejected. Similarly, in Mr. Rorison's hymn, instead of  
Three in One, and One in Three,  
appears—

Love of love ! as deep and free ;

and in the last verse—

Life of life, our Father be.

But we must close. Of the hymns in the "Berwick Hymnal" no small proportion are strange, and in it are not to be found many of the best hymns in the best Hymnals. But of these facts we say nothing. We have given illustrations of doctrinal alteration, and the book answers to the sample. On the good taste or literary propriety of sweeping changes in hymns, made without the confession "*altered*" or "*adapted*," critics may freely and justly write with severity ; but what may not be said when these changes involve the vital doctrines ?

---

## Short Notices.

---

*The Holy Bible and the Sacred Books of the East.* Five Addresses. By Sir M. MONIER-WILLIAMS, K.C.I.E., D.C.L., LL.D., Boden Professor of Sanskrit, and Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. Pp. 62. Seeley and Co.

WE heartily recommend this valuable little volume. The learned Professor has done well to reprint these Addresses (or Speeches) ; they are clear, strong, and rich : they read well. Each Address has a distinctive character of its own. The first deals with the whole subject of a comparison between our Holy Bible and the Sacred Books of the East ; the second deals especially with Buddhism ; the third with the Veda and the Kurān ; the fourth with Bibliolatry and Letter Worship ; the fifth with Zenāna Work in India. From the first (C.M.S. Anniversary, May 3, 1887) we give an extract. Referring to the danger which lurks beneath the duty of studying the Oriental books, the learned Professor said :

Perhaps I may best explain the nature of this danger by describing the process my own mind has gone through whilst engaged in studying the so-called Sacred Books of the East, as I have now done for at least forty years. In my youth I had been accustomed to hear all non-Christian religions described as "inventions of the devil." And when I began investigating Hinduism and Buddhism, some well-meaning Christian friends expressed their surprise that I should waste my time by grubbing in the dirty gutters of heathendom. Well, after a little examination, I found many beautiful gems glittering there—nay, I met with bright coruscations of true light flashing here and there amid the surrounding darkness. Now, fairness in fighting one's opponents is ingrained in every Englishman's nature, and as I prosecuted my researches into these non-Christian systems I began to foster a fancy that they had been unjustly treated. I began to observe and trace out curious coincidences and comparisons with our own Sacred Book of the East. I began, in short, to be a believer in what is called the Evolution and Growth of Religious Thought. "These imperfect systems," I said to myself, "are clearly steps in the development of man's religious instincts and aspirations. They are interesting efforts of the human mind struggling