

# 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)

regard to immigrants into a strange country; the first generation in such cases is bilingual; the second adopts exclusively the new language. There is no rule absolute. Many Persian immigrants into India centuries ago still speak Persian in their families, and elsewhere the languages of India. The Jews, wherever settled, have an alternative language in reserve. On the other hand, the French Huguenots, who went out to the Cape Settlement, became blended with the Dutch Boers, and have lost their French, as the Huguenot families have in England.

It is maintained in this series of essays, that our Lord and His twelve Apostles *were not* "bilingual," either on account of their Province or Family. It will hardly be asserted, without actual proof, that there were schools for teaching Greek in Nazareth or Capernaum, and that our Lord, and the twelve attended them. No doubt they used Latin and Greek loan-words, the names of particular places, such as Dekapolis, or of particular things, such as *χῆρος*, *δηνάριον*, just as to this day the English-speaking populations use French and Latin words, but nothing more.

ROBERT CUST.



#### ART. V.—THE REMUNERATION OF THE CLERGY.

"I WOULD have stuck to the curacy," said an experienced clergyman, commenting upon the news that his younger friend had accepted a certain living. The criticism was no doubt a contradiction to some current modes of thinking and wishing, but it was not altogether unjustified. As a curate, he meant, his friend would at least get that which it was agreed he should get; he would get it, too, in all probability paid with tolerable punctuality, and to a certainty he would get it without any considerable drawback. Nothing, as the phrase is, was expected of him. On the contrary, many generous persons would feel themselves at liberty, and some, perhaps, would even feel themselves bound, to help him. But directly he passed from the class of the "poor curate" into the class of the so-called "fat rector," all this would be changed. He would not, perhaps, even nominally be the recipient of a much larger sum than he had before; but the calls and drawbacks would be cruelly multiplied. The income he would really receive would be found to be far below its reputed value; whatever it might be, it would in most cases be paid, not with the old punctuality, but with delay, with irregularity, often with

grudging; the out-goings and drawbacks would prove to be far beyond what he had ever calculated in the greener days of his curacy; and, as to what might be expected of him, no one would feel called upon to show him any mercy in forming an opinion as to what a beneficed clergyman ought properly to do.

There are probably few statements that are presented in a form so misleading to the popular mind as the reputed incomes of the clergy. It is not generally realized how heavily they are affected by taxation. In one respect the position of the clergyman is unique—in the sense that no other professional man is placed in the same position. The peculiarity is this: the whole of his professional income is in many cases taxed for the local rates. The lawyer does not pay upon his gains, but upon the house or property that he occupies. So with every other profession or calling. The clergyman, however, cannot complain of this as being an injustice. It is his misfortune that his professional earnings, in the case of most beneficed clergy, take the form of an ownership in land. As a rector, he owns land, or a rent-charge, or both. And in that character he is theoretically treated for the purposes of taxation precisely as any other owner of land or rent-charge is treated. There are several heads under which the pressure of taxation upon this scale is severely felt. There is the poor rate, there is highway rate, there is school rate—a contribution which is practically obligatory, even where there is no School Board; while in the field of imperial taxation there is the land tax and the income tax. These being all levied upon a man's whole professional income, and not upon the mere rental of his house or property, will be found to amount to about 20 per cent. of the whole. There are, indeed, many cases where, owing to the magnitude of the poor rate, this amount would be very much higher. The reader has only to remember that owing to the agricultural depression there is at the present moment a fall in tithe-rent-charge of another 20 per cent.; and without being overburdened with figures, he will see at a glance that every clergyman's income is from these two causes alone at once cut down to 40 per cent. below its apparent value. But let him see what this means. It means that a clergyman who is reputed to have a good living of (say) £700 a year, has in reality only £420 to handle; and a man who has a medium living of (say) £300, has in reality only £180 from his benefice. There are, indeed, several other outgoings besides those which have just been enumerated—payments which a clergyman is legally bound to meet, and which go to reduce his nominal income still further. There are the payments which are the property of the Crown, there is the payment of the agent for collecting his income, and there is the

insurance and the repair of his buildings. Let all these things be put together, and the reader will find no difficulty in crediting the accounts which clergymen in different parts of England have published in the London newspapers in the course of the last few months. One rector in Hampshire says that he has a living of £620 nominal value; but he submits a detailed account which shows that he receives only £352 as net income. Another from Cambridgeshire has a rectory, which in days of agricultural prosperity was worth about £500 a year, but is now worth £104 in gross. From this the outgoings which have been enumerated above have to be deducted, and he is left with £56 as the income of his benefice. The same results come from other directions. "Fat livings," indeed, as people say! It would not be too much, perhaps, to say that from one end of England to the other there is no such thing as a "fat living." The term is simply an anachronism, a thing entirely out of date, a survival of what were for the clergy indisputably better times than these.

An ominous sign of the times in connection with this subject is the increasing frequency with which men, who are anything but superannuated, are resigning benefices which once no doubt they regarded as the prizes of a legitimate ambition. The present writer is acquainted with one district which enjoys the exceptional advantage of being near to London in one of the home counties, but within which—in a ring of ten or eleven miles diameter—no less than eight incumbents have resigned their benefices within the last year or two. These have not been worn-out men, who could have no reasonable hope of doing further work, and accordingly resigned under the Act. They have not been promoted men, who have gone to a better appointment, for in every single instance they have gone from their benefice to nothing; but what is most striking of all is that the benefices which they resigned are not poor ones, but, on the contrary, are in several cases what used to be considered the "good livings" of the district. The commuted rent-charge of one of them, for example, is over £400, besides land and good house, while the population is extremely small; of another, it is over £400, with very small population and good house; of a third, it is over £600, besides land and good house; whilst another, alike for its income, its patronage, and the eminence of the men who have held it, has always been regarded as quite a prize, and has a commuted rent-charge of considerably over £1,000 a year, with very easy duty. It would have been an unheard-of thing in former days for men to abandon such appointments as these; but such a pass have things come to now, that their fortunate possessors simply think them not worth holding, and prefer to leave the ranks of the benefited

clergy altogether rather than continue their tenure. There will, of course, be an abundance of candidates who would only be too thankful to get possession of such appointments as these; but an actual experience of what they covet would, under the same conditions, probably bring them to the same conclusions as their predecessors have expressed in these resignations; and, meantime, the thoughtful observer can but wonder at the immense change that has taken place in the practical valuation of what many a flippant writer scornfully parades as "the loaves and fishes," the "fat livings" and the "good things" of the English Church.

It is quite evident that there are some mistaken notions current upon this question. It often seems to be fancied that, whatever embarrassment there is arises from some mismanagement or some fault of distribution; and it is insinuated that, if the clergy only had the will, they already have the power to cure all the evils under this head, of which they are so bitterly complaining. In the columns of that caustic and clever journal, which is supposed to be ironically entitled *Truth*, there was lately an example of the blunders which even a capable writer is liable to make when he is handling a subject of which he cannot be presumed to have more than a superficial experience: "The return of the property and revenues of the Established Church," said this writer, "respecting which Mr. Channing, M.P., recently inquired in the House of Commons, will, when published, reveal much more than is generally known about the very large funds which the beneficed clergy are in the enjoyment of." It may reveal much "to the general"—that is, "the general" (in Shakespearian phrase) does not know much which it might already know, and which it will not think worthy of notice until it appears in a Parliamentary Return. But as to "revealing" anything which is at present inaccessible, or which at present is designedly suppressed, there is substantially nothing to reveal. It is all published over and over again, not only in mass, as in several of the lists and directories, but actually in detail in some of them; published, too, not only in bulk for the whole English Church from some irresponsible office in London, but published in the calendar of every diocese in England and Wales, with all the advantage and, let us add, with all the responsibility of local knowledge, and published, as regards the largest item of the Church's property—the commuted rent-charge—under official and legal guarantee, for the official schedule of the property lies in every parish-chest throughout the land for the inspection of all whom it may concern. All, in fact, that the expected Parliamentary Return can do is to present in a collective and authoritative form facts which individually are perfectly well known at present to those whose business it is to know them.

We move in the same atmosphere of mistake as that article proceeds. "Few have any idea," continues the writer, "of the number of good livings in country districts which are held by well-to-do incumbents whose circumstances are not brought prominently before the eyes of the public. Our agricultural counties abound with benefices possessing incomes of from £500 to £1,000 per annum and upwards." The picture is overdrawn in almost every particular. To test the word "abound," let the reader open a page of any one of the Diocesan Calendars and see how many of the thirty or forty benefices cited in the page reach the high figures which are alleged to be so common. He will find one or two such every here and there; but his conclusion will have to be that they are sporadic rather than abundant. It is quite true that there are in most districts a number of well-to-do incumbents; but they are generally well-to-do by virtue of their private fortunes, and not by virtue of their professional gains. It would be truer to say that "few have any idea" what a large proportion of the Church's work is being carried on by the private fortunes of the clergy. There are multitudes of curates being kept whose pay never would be forthcoming if the incumbents did not dip into their private purse to find it. So general is this fact that in one of the recent Diocesan Conferences a return was actually moved for with the view of exhibiting its prevalence to the public eye. An incumbent who can be said to be "well-to-do" on his professional earnings is a *rara avis* indeed. Even in the case of a benefice whose revenue is nominally considerable, the income is too often subject to such heavy charges and drawbacks that after all it is a comparatively trifling amount which finds its way into the beneficiary's pocket. Moreover, while we are debating these worldly questions, it is only fair to recollect that the holders of the large benefices are in a worldly sense amongst the successful men of their profession. And then, what is £500 or £1,000 a year as the equivalent of professional success in a learned and, it must be said, a costly profession? What would a lawyer think of it? What would even a prosperous country doctor say to it as the ultimate limit of all possible ambitions?

But we have not come to the end of the misleading statements put forward in this manifesto yet. It says that "the rank and file of the clergy will be found to be in possession of a revenue which, if it were anything like fairly distributed, would supply ample remuneration for every clergyman engaged in parochial work in this country." The figures for making this calculation are already before the world. The calculation has in point of fact been made, and the result has proved that if all the property of the clergy were thrown into a common fund,

that fund would not be sufficiently large to supply every employed clergyman with even so modest an income as £200 a year on the principle of equal distribution. Then, moreover, who is going to carry into effect such a scheme as that? Most friends of the Church would welcome it if it were practicable. The largest incomes are at the present time often to be found in the smallest, the most retired, and the least important places; whilst the large towns are often in possession of endowments so small as to be out of all proportion to the work and responsibility of the position. This operates disastrously for the Church in several ways. To mention only one of its results—it tempts some of the ablest men into the smallest places, where the Church is very far from getting all that is to be got out of such men. It is not only the critics of the English Church, but its best friends also, who would be glad to have this changed. But how is the cure of the evil to be effected? Where is the statesman who would be sufficiently influential to secure the necessary consents? For though we speak of redistributing the property of the Church, there is a touch of inaccuracy—a fatal inaccuracy—in this case, about the phrase. There is no such thing as the property of the Church. It has been laid down by the highest legal authority that the property of the Church is a phrase unknown to the law of England. The so-called property of the Church is a number of separate properties belonging to separate corporations which are resident in the various parishes throughout the country.

What argument would induce a small country parish with a relatively rich endowment to consent to the alienation of a large slice of its revenues in order to provide a better income for the clergy of the county town? The inhabitants of such a parish have their expectations in connection with the revenues of their Church. If by the bounty of their ancestors their Church has an income of (say) £700 a year, to put it bluntly, they expect a £700 man; broadly speaking, they get him at present. And they are not likely to rise to such a level of unselfishness as to consent to be put off with a £150 man. But to take their property from them and to give it to someone else without their consent would be an act of spoliation, and, in the strictest sense of the old Westminster proverb, would be a flagrant example of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Sooner or later there must come upon the English people a day of awakening upon this subject. The sooner it comes the better for the Church. But it is a dream to imagine that the evil can be cured by any re-arrangement or disclosure. Handle them as you will, the endowments of the Church of England are, in their existing state, hopelessly insufficient to do the work of the present day. There is not money enough to pay the men

even while they work; and still less is there money enough to pension off those who are no longer able to work. There is, of course, a higher platform on which such questions can always stand. It is not exclusively a matter of wages. The English people may decide, if they are so pleased, that they will have a mendicant ministry for their Church. There will be plenty of men—and some of them men of the highest stamp and capacity, too—who will come forward to take their places in the ranks of such a ministry. But that is just what English people will not decide to have. They prefer, and they are likely to go on preferring, to have a ministry composed of men who live upon the same average level as themselves, who have had the best and most expensive education, and who have acquired experience of all the varied sides of family life. If that is a luxury, they cannot enjoy the luxury and save the money too. It was laughingly said by a great statesman that England was too poor to build herself a picture-gallery, and so an anonymous donor had kindly undertaken to build one for her at his own sole expense. It will have to be something of this kind that the Church of the future will have to look to. There must have been an immense wave of pious generosity sweeping over the country in those early centuries when rich men were giving to the Church her title to those endowments, which have, in part at least, survived down to the present moment. The cause is just as good now as it was then. The appeal which religion makes is never threadbare. Display the need, and the resources will come. Disendow to-day, and re-endowment will begin to-morrow. No sane person is likely to contend that, with society constituted as English society is constituted in the nineteenth century, the Church can do her work to the highest effect unless she has command of ample resources. And perhaps the first step towards getting those resources consists in evaporating that mischievous idea which infests the popular mind at the present day, that the Church has all she could require if she only chose to use it. Rich and thinking men will begin to think, if the real facts are not distorted and obscured. No man, perhaps, might have been less expected to speak favourably to us than Thomas Carlyle; but "there is not a hamlet," he says in one of his essays, "where poor peasants congregate but, by one means and another, a Church apparatus has been got together: roofed edifice, with revenues and belfries, pulpit, reading-desk with books and methods—possibility, in short, and strict prescription, that a man stand there and speak of spiritual things to men. [It is beautiful . . . Whom have we to compare with him? Of all public functionaries boarded and lodged on the industry of modern Europe, is there one worthier of the board he has? A man even professing, and never so languidly making still



some endeavour, to save the souls of men : contrast him with a man professing to do little but shoot the partridges of men."

H. T. ARMFIELD.

---

## Reviews.

---

*The Ministry of the Christian Church.* By CHARLES GORE, M.A., Principal of the Pusey House. London : Rivingtons.

WE have here a work of great learning and research, very able, and, on the whole, fair and convincing. We may not be able to accept all Mr. Gore's positions, certainly not all the arguments by which he supports them ; but, with him, we fully believe that the three orders of the ministry have existed in the Church from the earliest days, and are in accordance with the will of the great Head of the Church. At first probably there were no local dioceses, except, perhaps, St. James's at Jerusalem. The first true "Bishops" seem to have had a *roving* commission (if the expression may be forgiven), as the Apostles had before them. This view appears to satisfy the conditions of the case, and to explain the statements of early writers, and it is confirmed by the case of Titus, first appointed to Crete, and then (2 Tim. iv. 10) going to Dalmatia, presumably with the like commission.

Mr. Gore's work is in some parts rather heavy reading, owing to the lengthy quotations from the Fathers which he thinks it necessary to give to establish his argument. This, however, shows his painstaking research into the subject. The three following passages give a not unfair summary of Mr. Gore's views :

(1.) The ministry advanced always upon the principle of succession, so that whatever functions a man held in the Church at any time were simply those that had been committed to him by some one among his predecessors who had held the authority to give orders "by regular devolution from the Apostles" (p. 343).

(2.) That it was by a common instinct that the threefold or episcopal organization was everywhere adopted ; that it was a law of the being of the Church that it should put on this form . . . and that this fact seems to speak of a Divine institution almost as plainly as if our Lord had in so many words prescribed this form of Church government (p. 343).

(3.) The individual life can receive this fellowship with God only through membership in the one body, and by dependence upon social sacraments of regeneration, of confirmation, of communion, of absolution, of which ordained ministers are the appointed instruments. A fundamental principle of Christianity is that of social dependence (p. 94).

Surely in this third passage Mr. Gore goes beyond the teaching both of Holy Scripture and of experience. Surely the latter shows that God has been pleased to bless the ministrations of ministers of non-episcopal bodies, irregular though they be, in the salvation of souls and the advancement of His kingdom, and that the individual life has received fellowship with God, though there has been no recognition of these "social sacraments." We agree that a fundamental principle of Christianity, too often lost sight of, is "that of social dependence" ; but "the wind bloweth where it listeth," and unless all the teaching of experience is to be ignored, many who have never been confirmed, and who recognise no "social sacrament of absolution," have that true spiritual life which is "hid with Christ in God."