

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

monstrous offspring, and penetrates as far as Tiamat. They draw near to one another; they fling themselves into the combat; they meet one another in the struggle. When Tiamat opens her mouth to swallow Merodach, he thrusts the hurricane into it; it fills her paunch, her breast swells, her maw is split. Merodach thrusts his lance into her paunch, bursts open her breast, binds the monster, and slays her.

Let us contrast with this the parallel account in the Hebrew narrative :

And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters,
 And let it divide the waters from the waters. And it was so.
 And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together
 into one place,
 And let the dry land appear. And it was so.

Note, on the one side, the feebleness and terror of the other gods, and the terrible struggle by which Merodach, the wisest of the gods, gained the victory; and on the other, the entire absence of all apparent effort, and the glorious energy of the calm fiat of Omnipotence, through the twice-repeated "And God said." "He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast."

ROBERT BRUCE, D.D.

(To be continued.)



ART. IV.—THE JUNIOR CLERGY AND DIOCESAN PATRONAGE.

THE difficulty of getting Bills for the reform of our Church's organization passed by the House of Commons is a thing which was abundantly manifested two years ago in reference to the Criminous Clerks Bill, and we must always expect more or less of the same discreditable action on the part of the extreme political Dissenters, as to whose ideas of decency and morality the less said the better. The duty, however, remains with us to keep "pegging away" at practical reforms in our Church system. And we now desire to call attention to one practical reform which does not as yet seem to have been suggested by any of our lay or clerical friends. We refer to the need of some readjustment of the official episcopal patronage. The inequalities in this respect in regard to different dioceses do not seem to have struck men's minds, and yet such inequalities exist between our dioceses in the most marked and utterly unjustifiable degree. In fact, it almost seems to be the rule in the Church of England that where work is hardest promotion should be slowest—a very undesirable state of affairs, as all must admit. In all dioceses the

official patronage of the Bishop and of the Dean and Chapter is what those of the clergy look to for preferment who have not the advantage to possess wealthy and influential connexions, but whose only passport to promotion consists in merit—in other words, earnestness, diligence, and learning. Speaking generally, in agricultural dioceses, where clerical work is comparatively easy, and the strain of life not severe, the Bishop and the Cathedral Chapter have considerable patronage; whereas in those dioceses where the people are massed in large numbers, in urban and semi-urban districts, and where, in consequence, work is heavy, and clerical life is lived under a severe and continuous strain—such, for instance, as Rochester, Wakefield, and Liverpool dioceses—the Bishop has comparatively little preferment at his disposal.

The best way to illustrate this inequality is to give in tabular form

THE OFFICIAL DIOCESAN PATRONAGE OF ENGLAND.

| Diocese. | Population. | Parochial Clergy. | | Diocesan Patronage. No. of Benefices. | |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------------|----------|--|----------|
| | | Incumbents. | Curates. | Bishops. | Chapter. |
| Canterbury | 745,000 | 438 | 181 | 186 | 41 |
| York | 1,447,000 | 630 | 250 | 166 | 27 |
| London | 3,245,000 | 614 | 628 | 189 | 82 |
| Durham | 1,017,000 | 236 | 198 | 97 | 59 |
| Winchester | 976,000 | 551 | 258 | 117 | 30 |
| Bangor | 215,000 | 132 | 60 | 70 | |
| Bath and Wells | 429,000 | 473 | 132 | 48 | 24 |
| Carlisle | 424,000 | 293 | 81 | 54 | 31 |
| Chester | 730,000 | 265 | 142 | 64 | 14 |
| Chichester | 549,000 | 382 | 160 | 58 | 24 |
| Ely | 524,000 | 561 | 159 | 55 | 21 |
| Exeter | 629,000 | 496 | 180 | 42 | 52 |
| Gloucester and Bristol | 744,000 | 498 | 200 | 109 | 57 |
| Hereford | 217,000 | 426 | 87 | 32 | 30 |
| Lichfield | 1,196,000 | 472 | 202 | 102 | 13 |
| Lincoln | 472,000 | 581 | 135 | 102 | 31 |
| Liverpool | 1,207,000 | 200 | 210 | 9 | |
| Llandaff | 799,000 | 226 | 199 | 82 | 25 |
| Manchester | 2,644,000 | 515 | 335 | 147 | 23 |
| Newcastle | 509,000 | 164 | 68 | 24 | |
| Norwich | 710,000 | 914 | 253 | 95 | 44 |
| Oxford | 613,000 | 647 | 249 | 116 | 89 |
| Peterborough | 692,000 | 582 | 254 | 87 | 8 |
| Ripon | 1,020,000 | 351 | 170 | 74 | 11 |
| Rochester | 1,938,000 | 317 | 260 | 52 | 32 |
| St. Albans | 1,006,000 | 627 | 150 | 65 | |
| St. Asaph | 270,000 | 205 | 101 | 114 | |
| St. David's | 496,000 | 402 | 116 | 145 | 10 |
| Salisbury | 369,000 | 490 | 206 | 64 | 21 |
| Southwell | 975,000 | 491 | 181 | 62 | |
| Truro | 325,000 | 237 | 96 | 47 | 12 |
| Wakefield | 719,000 | 165 | 116 | 23 | |
| Worcester | 1,228,000 | 484 | 199 | 97 | 38 |

A study of this table reveals in a very unmistakable manner the uneven and haphazard distribution of official ecclesiastical Church patronage. Take, for instance, the two adjoining dioceses of Winchester and Rochester. In the former there are 258 curates for 551 benefices, or more than two benefices to provide a chance of preferment for each curate, supposing, for the sake of argument, that all benefices in the diocese are filled up by the appointment of curates working within the same geographical area. Affording a chance of promotion for these 258 curates, there are in the Bishop's gift no less than 117 benefices, and in the gift of the Dean and Chapter 30 more, making a total of 147 benefices in official ecclesiastical patronage to which these 258 curates may look for preferment. Coming to Rochester diocese, we find a very different state of affairs. The number of curates is not very much below the number of the incumbents. Chances of preferment must therefore be small. To provide preferment for 260 curates, the Bishop has 52 benefices and the Chapter 32—a total of 84; or, in other words, there is one benefice in diocesan patronage to every three curates. In Winchester diocese, where work is chiefly in agricultural parishes, performed under healthy conditions and without the rush and hurry which is so characteristic of modern town life, there is official diocesan patronage to the amount of more than one benefice to every two curates. In Rochester diocese, containing South London, with its teeming population and its bewildering social and spiritual problems, chances of preferment stand as follows, supposing, as we have said before, for the sake of comparison, that all the livings in the diocese are filled by clergymen working in the diocese. Supposing, therefore, the 84 benefices in diocesan patronage to be thus filled up, there remain 176 curates to be provided with preferment, and for this purpose there is a balance of only 233 benefices all told, including those in the gift of the Crown, the Lord Chancellor, incumbents of mother churches, the Universities and trustees, besides those livings in the gift of private patrons. Preferment in such a case must inevitably be slow indeed, and the more so, in increasing ratio, as the number of assistant curates is increasing, we believe, of late years, three times as fast as the number of incumbencies.

Upon the same hypothesis—viz., that the parishes in diocesan patronage are all filled by the appointment of curates working in the diocese—we should have in Winchester diocese 111 other curates to be provided with benefices, and for these there would be the balance of 404 livings remaining after deducting the 147 which are in diocesan patronage from the total number of 551 benefices within the limits of the

diocese. Thus, in Rochester diocese, outside the diocesan patronage, there are 233 benefices to provide preferment for 176 curates, or less than three benefices to every two curates, while in Winchester diocese there are 404 to 111 curates, or nearly four benefices to one curate. Thus the curate working in the quiet, steady-going agricultural diocese of Winchester has manifestly a vastly larger chance of promotion than his brother working in the busy diocese of Rochester.

Going into the adjoining diocese of Oxford, we find a still greater contrast. Here there are 647 benefices to 249 curates, or more than five benefices to every two curates. The diocesan patronage in the gift of the Bishop and the Cathedral Chapter amounts to 205 livings. Thus, there are diocesan benefices, if one may use the term, almost sufficient, so far as number is concerned, to provide for all the curates in Oxford diocese, while for the balance of 44 still, under the same hypothesis, unprovided for, there are no less than 398 benefices in private hands or in official lay or clerical patronage. A great contrast, indeed, to Rochester diocese. We do not forget that we have somewhat overstated the case in this instance, as the Dean and Chapter of Christ Church occupy a somewhat different position to an ordinary cathedral chapter, and have demands upon their attention arising from their collegiate status.

The same thing holds good in the Welsh dioceses; viz., that in those dioceses where work is easiest promotion is most rapid and abundant. In each of the North Wales dioceses the number of benefices is double the number of curates, and in each case the diocesan patronage alone is more than enough to afford promotion for every single curate. In St. David's diocese the proportion of benefices to curates is still larger, being no less than seven to two. And yet, with such good chances of promotion already before them, the curates of St. David's have such a further chance of preferment as is involved in the possession of 155 benefices in diocesan patronage for 116 curates. Compare these three agricultural dioceses with that of Llandaff, containing a rapidly-increasing population of 800,000, and including within its limits all Glamorganshire except Swansea and its district, and also the English county of Monmouth. The population in this case is massed in considerable mining villages, some of which are sufficiently large to be considered as towns; and while in most of the Welsh counties the population has been for a good many years steadily diminishing, in Cardiff and Newport and in the mining and manufacturing districts of Glamorganshire and West Monmouthshire, population has been for the last forty or fifty years increasing by leaps and bounds. Church-work is, in fact, carried on under great difficulties in this

diocese, where, moreover, the number of curates is almost equal to that of the incumbents. It is interesting to note that, with the single exception of the capital of the empire, there is only one other diocese in which there is so large a proportion of curates to incumbents, and that is the diocese of Liverpool, a city which, though far outside the geographical limits of the Principality, is constantly spoken of as "the capital of North Wales," just as Cardiff, which with Llandaff forms one city, is called "the capital of South Wales." It is, by the way, also a suggestive fact, which may well be mentioned in a day when we so often hear the Welsh spoken of as "a nation of Nonconformists," that the proportion of the population coming to the Bishop for confirmation is just the same in Llandaff diocese as it is in that of Liverpool. While thus in Llandaff diocese the number of junior clergy is so large in proportion to the number of the beneficed, the diocesan patronage only amounts to 107 benefices for 199 curates—a remarkable contrast, as regards a curate's chances of promotion, to, say, the adjoining diocese of Hereford on the east, and still more so to that of St. David's on the west.

Again looking at the table, compare Norwich and Newcastle. In the former diocese the proportion of benefices to curates is not very much short of four to one, while in the latter it is not so very much more than two to one. For the 253 curates of Norwich there are 139 livings in the official clerical patronage of the diocese, or considerably more than one to every two curates, while in Newcastle there is only one to every three. In Wakefield diocese the proportion is still worse, viz., only one to every five.

But by far the most startling contrast in the whole of the table is that between two dioceses—those of Lincoln and Liverpool—which come in immediate succession in the list. In Lincoln there are 581 benefices to 135 curates, or over four to one, a proportion which in itself is suggestive of rapid promotion for the junior clergy. But, still further, there are for these 135 young deacons and presbyters to look forward to no less than 133 benefices in the gift of the clerical authorities of the diocese—just one for each curate. Verily, he that hath, to him shall be given! Prospects of promotion are indeed excellent in this favoured diocese! And what of Liverpool? In that small but very thickly-peopled Lancashire diocese, the number of curates is actually greater than that of incumbents. Small indeed, therefore, must be a young clergyman's chances of becoming incumbent of a parish himself. But has not the Bishop patronage adequate, it will be asked, to afford reasonable prospects of promotion for young clergymen who are willing to spend and be spent in his crowded and busy

diocese? Alas! no. A glance at the table shows that he has the patronage of but nine benefices, and of these, four are only in his gift alternately with the Crown. The injustice of the present state of affairs stands out in a still more marked manner when it is remembered that fifteen years ago in the undivided diocese of Chester there was diocesan patronage available for promoting promising young presbyters to the extent of 82 benefices; viz., 14 in the hands of the Cathedral Chapter and 68 in the hands of the Bishop. Of these 68, Chester, with only 140 curates, secured, on the division of the old diocese, no less than 62, while Liverpool diocese for its share received 6. And the cathedral patronage remained entirely attached to the comfortably-placed clergy of the cheese-making county. Of all the contrasts in our Church, there is certainly none greater than that between Lincoln and Liverpool. In Lincoln diocese work is easy and steady-going; it is not even a mountainous diocese, with long journeys in winter-time over snow-clad, hilly roads, as in the case of St. David's or Bangor, but a quiet, agricultural county with parishes of only moderate size and with resident squires in abundance. Of Liverpool diocese the exact opposite has to be said. Parishes have in many cases overwhelmingly large populations, mining and manufacturing being the occupations of the people, except in the city of Liverpool itself, where shipping is of course predominant. About 25 per cent. of the population of the diocese consists of Irish Romanists. Resident landowners are very few, most of the landed aristocracy having "gone South"; and it is only too well known among Church folk how much less ready to recognise their obligations to their poorer neighbours are "the commercial rich" than the much-abused landed aristocracy of England. And even of the few resident landowners left in South-West Lancashire, a very large proportion—and those some of the wealthiest—are, as in North and East Lancashire, Roman Catholics. Thus, the clergy of Liverpool diocese have to work under every possible disadvantage. Could there well, we would ask, be a greater contrast than between Lincoln and Liverpool, so far as the temporal prospects of the clergy are concerned? And the inequality is every year being intensified. In 1880 there were 120 curates; twelve years later they numbered 210. Thus, while the population of that diocese had increased 25 per cent., the assistant clergy had increased 75 per cent.—a suggestively encouraging specimen, by the way, of the results of subdividing a large diocese. Taking everything into consideration, we shall not, perhaps, be far wrong in saying that while clerical work is on the average twice as wearing in the diocese of Liverpool as it is in

that of Lincoln, the chances of promotion for a young clergyman are five times as great in the latter as they are in the former diocese. As to which fact we can only say, "Verbum sat sapienti."

And now for the remedy for these grave, and utterly unjustifiable, and most harmful inequalities. Surely this must lie in a considerable measure of readjustment of patronage as between the various dioceses. Want of solidarity between its various parts is one of the greatest weaknesses of the English Church, and even of the whole Anglican Communion. It is so in a marked degree in this matter of diocesan patronage. A measure of redistribution of official ecclesiastical patronage is evidently needed. Nor is this any new idea. In 1847, when the See of Manchester was founded, the new diocese had allotted to it a number of livings in the dioceses of Durham and Lincoln, the episcopal patronage in those two dioceses being unduly large. The same had previously been done when Ripon became an episcopal see. Further action on the same lines is evidently needed, the more so that during the forty-seven years that have elapsed since the foundation of the first of the two Lancashire sees six more new bishoprics have been constituted. And it will be noticed, on looking at the table, that it is the new bishoprics which have fared worst. In the case of each of these six subdivisions, the new diocese has had to start without any endowments for its cathedral church, and Truro and Liverpool without any cathedral church worthy of the name. Thus, they have laboured under very serious drawbacks of a kind which were inevitable; but it was not by any means inevitable that the Bishop of the newly-constituted diocese should be without a reasonable amount of patronage, affording opportunities of promoting earnest workers among his clergy. If either way, the Additional Bishoprics Bill of 1878 should have erred on the side of undue generosity to these new dioceses, all of which have had special difficulties to contend with.

In dealing with this matter, we are of opinion that the patronage of the Cathedral Chapters should be dealt with in one general scheme along with that of the bishops. Thus, the Dean and Chapter of Carlisle have 31 livings, and the Bishop has 54—all these, though the number of curates is only 81. Two of the Chapter livings are situated in another diocese, viz., Newcastle, which is but poorly provided with diocesan patronage. We would suggest that these two should be handed over to the Bishop of Newcastle, and if the Chapter hand over 9 more to the same diocese of Newcastle, they will still have 20 benefices in their gift—quite enough, considering all the circumstances. If the Bishop of Carlisle,

moreover, were to transfer a dozen out of his 54, say six each to the Bishops of Liverpool and of Wakefield, he would still have 30 per cent. more patronage than his brother of Hereford possesses. Again, the Chapter of Durham Cathedral have 22 benefices in their gift in Northumberland, and 9 in Yorkshire, in addition to their valuable and extensive patronage in their own diocese. These 31 livings might well be divided between the two dioceses of Liverpool and Wakefield, giving, say, six to the Bishop of Wakefield, and the remaining 25 to his very poorly-endowed brother of Liverpool for his very numerous body of clergy. Again, it would seem not unreasonable that the Bishop of Winchester should transfer to the See of Rochester a certain number of his 117 livings, say 17 of them; and perhaps half a dozen of those in the gift of the Chapter of Winchester might also be transferred to the Bishop of Rochester. It is unquestionably much better when a Bishop's patronage lies in his own diocese, but where this cannot be, patronage in another diocese, especially if an adjacent diocese, is manifestly better than none at all.

And in this connection it may be remarked that in redistributing patronage it would be desirable, as far as possible, to give to any diocese benefices in a diocese fairly near, rather than in one far off. It would, for instance, be a greater gain to Liverpool diocese for the Bishop to have livings in his gift in Cheshire, in Yorkshire, in Westmorland or Cumberland or Northumberland, than in Kent or Dorsetshire. Many a man would gladly accept a living within 50 or 100 miles of his old sphere of work who would hesitate to remove 200 miles off. We have spoken of preferment chiefly from the assistant curate's point of view; but this is only one way of looking at the question. In such dioceses as Rochester, Liverpool, Wakefield or Newcastle, where parishes are so largely urban, incumbents get worn out comparatively early, and at fifty-five, or even at fifty, a man really needs to be removed to an easier sphere of work. He has, we will say, been an incumbent for fifteen or twenty years in some town parish in Liverpool diocese. His children have grown up in the town where he is beneficed, and been educated at the local grammar-school, and the elder ones probably also have started life in the same town. Perhaps one or two daughters are married and settled in the same locality. Altogether he is attached to the particular town by very strong ties. At the same time, he finds himself at fifty-five by no means able to get through the same amount of work as at forty-five, and he is conscious that it would be a gain to his parish if he were to make way for a younger man, and a gain to himself in health and general comfort of mind and body if he could obtain a sphere of work somewhere in the country or

in one of the comparatively small parishes of our old-fashioned country towns, where he could settle down to spend the remaining years of his life. Were such a man offered a parish within 50 miles of his present benefice, he would most gladly accept it; but if the benefice offered him were 150 miles away, he would certainly think twice before consenting to remove so far from the associations of the best part of a lifetime. The need of means for enabling clergymen in large towns to remove to less laborious posts is only too apparent to all who are well acquainted with clerical life and work in our large towns. Thus, it would be much better that additional patronage for the Bishop of Rochester should be obtained from the adjoining dioceses of Winchester, Canterbury and Oxford, than from the distant dioceses of Carlisle, Durham or York. The Chapter of Canterbury might well surrender ten of its livings to Rochester, and the Bishop of Oxford might perfectly well hand over, say, twenty of his livings to Rochester, and ten to Southwell.

Again, the Bishop of Lincoln might with advantage hand over, say, thirty of his livings, and the Lincoln Chapter eight or ten of theirs, to provide additional patronage for Southwell and Liverpool—say, ten to Southwell and thirty to Liverpool. The Bishop of Lincoln has eleven benefices in his gift in his cathedral city. If three of these were transferred to each of the Bishops of Rochester and Liverpool, the Bishop of Lincoln would still have five in his hands in that city, and half a dozen quiet but congenial spheres of labour would be provided for elderly incumbents of town parishes in Rochester and Liverpool dioceses, who, though no longer fully equal to the work of a parish of 8,000 or 10,000 people in a great city with its ever-changing population, would be fully competent to work one of average size in the quiet city of Lincoln. Not only would a change of work be provided for incumbents who needed it in two very populous dioceses, but Lincoln city itself would be benefited by having introduced into its parishes clergymen who had had experience considerably different to that obtainable in a quiet agricultural diocese. The one great advantage of our system of patronage is the variety it produces in the method of appointing to benefices, and for one individual, even if he be the Bishop himself, to have the patronage of so large a number of livings as eleven out of fourteen in one small town cannot be a wise thing. It puts quite too much power in one man's hands. Whereas, if our suggestion be carried out, there will be a most beneficial variety introduced. The same sort of thing holds good of the cities of Norwich, York and Exeter. In the first-named the Dean and Chapter have in their gift no less than thirteen churches, most of them with comparatively small populations. Three each might well be given to Southwell and Liverpool. Not long

ago the Dean of Norwich was announced to have prepared a scheme for uniting several of these small parishes in the cathedral city. Well, if the city of Norwich be the only thing to be considered, this would doubtless be a wise thing. But it is not. These little parishes have churches which, though poorly filled, perhaps, now, would very probably be fairly well attended under the ministry of men who had spent a stirring life in one of our great cities. The same holds true of York, where a similar scheme of union of parishes was suggested some half-dozen years ago, and of Exeter, where the Dean and Chapter have in their gift no less than twelve parishes, half of which might very well go to increase the diocesan patronage of, say, Liverpool.

We have, it will be noticed, made no suggestion for increasing the official ecclesiastical patronage of the diocese of London, although, as in the case of Liverpool and Llandaff, the number of curates equals that of incumbents; and for this reason: In London a curate has chances of promotion quite beyond those which exist in any other diocese. For the nobility and gentry, who have so many livings in their gift, come up to town for part of every year, and thus they have a chance of hearing, and often enough do hear, something as to what is being done in the parishes of the Metropolis, even to some extent as to what is going on in the parishes of the East End. And perhaps one who lives in the Northern Province, the clergy of which have for so many years been so systematically overlooked in the administration of the patronage of the Crown by successive Prime Ministers and Lord Chancellors, may be pardoned for thinking that London is more than able to look after herself.

In conclusion we would say that it is a manifest duty to remove from our Church such harmful inequalities as we have pointed out. And we would suggest, alike to clergy and laity, to the dignitary of the Church as well as to the quiet, steady-going parish priest, that some such scheme as we have suggested for some amount of redistribution of diocesan patronage is an absolute necessity, and should be put into shape without delay. We can but think that the House of Commons rather than the House of Lords would be the legislative chamber into which a Bill for this purpose should be introduced. Probably the best course to adopt would be for the Church party recently formed in the House of Commons to bring forward a resolution condemning these inequalities, and to thus secure the appointment of a Royal Commission charged to formulate a scheme by which the chances of promotion in the Church shall be rendered more equal between the various dioceses.

LAICUS LIVERPOLIENSIS.