

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

all her sufferings to the event of rejoining Mr. Scott in glory. On one occasion she very simply and fervently said to him : "Oh, sir, when I get to heaven, and have seen Jesus Christ, the very next person that I ask for will be you."

His curates were treated in a like loving manner. When he had been occasionally sharp, he would beg to be forgiven : "I meant it for your good ; but, like everything of mine, it was mixed with sin. Impute it not, however, to my religion, but to my want of *more* religion." And Mr. Wilberforce tells us that if in the course of the day Scott had been betrayed into what he deemed an improper degree of warmth, he would publicly implore forgiveness for his infirmity in the evening devotions of his family.

JOHN ALT PORTER.

(To be continued.)



ART. V.—THE EAST LONDON CHURCH FUND.

THE East London Church Fund is perhaps the most typical of all efforts for Church Extension in populous districts. It was founded in 1880 by the Bishop-Suffragan for East London, Dr. Walsham How, under the rule of the earnest and spiritually-minded Dr. Jackson, Bishop of London. Its object is to provide practical teachers of practical Christianity—clergy, deaconesses, lay evangelists, Scripture readers, mission women, and parish nurses—to live and work in the poor parishes of the East London District, which now includes a million and a half of people.

The spiritual destitution which all through this century has afflicted, and still afflicts, such vast congested areas of population as East London, is owing to three things : (1) the indifference of past generations ; (2) the impossibility up till Sir Robert Peel's time of creating a new parish without an Act of Parliament ; and (3) the prodigious rate at which, owing to railways and machinery, the population has been increasing, and is continuing to increase.

The change in London itself is, of course, enormous. During the Queen's reign considerably more than half a million new houses have been built, and more than 2,000 miles of new streets have been made. In 1837 the population was under two millions ; now the population of greater London is nearly six millions. The diocese of London (*i.e.*, the Middlesex portion of the Metropolis) contains nearly three and a half million souls, and about half this vast multitude belongs to

the East London District, under the Bishop of Stepney's care. The increase has been almost entirely confined to the suburban districts; *e.g.*, the population of Stepney, about 70,000, has remained stationary, while Islington has grown from 40,000 to 340,000, and Hackney from 30,000 to 230,000. Tottenham and Enfield have, perhaps, increased in still greater proportion.

Before the Queen came to the throne the Church Pastoral Aid Society was founded, in 1836, and in the same year the Additional Curates' Society. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was doing on a large scale all that it could to help the Church at home and abroad. The Incorporated Church Building Society was founded in 1818. The National Society, under the clear-headed zeal of John Sinclair, Archdeacon of Middlesex, was endeavouring to supply every parish in the kingdom with a first-rate parish school. In the early years of the century Dr. Yates, Chaplain of Chelsea Hospital, startled the public by a pamphlet showing that 946,000 persons were without provision of the means of grace. In 1818 Lord Liverpool's Government carried a motion through Parliament voting a million for building churches in London and the large towns. In 1824, £500,000 was added. In 1828 Bishop Blomfield became Bishop of London. In 1835 a powerful letter was written to him by Baptist Noel urging him to place himself at the head of a great movement for supplying the spiritual needs of London. In 1836 a great meeting was held at London House, which issued in the formation of the Metropolis Churches Fund. In an appeal to the diocese Bishop Blomfield quoted the report of the Church Commissioners, pointing out that in London and its suburbs the entire population of 34 parishes amounted to 1,137,000, while there was church room for only 101,682, and but 139 clergymen. Bishop Blomfield designed to build fifty new churches, but during his long and glorious episcopate he had the happiness of consecrating no less than 200.

Bishop Tait went on with the work of church-building and the evangelization of the people with splendid capacity and untiring zeal. At length, in Bishop Jackson's time, the hour came for concentrating the work previously done, and inspiring the clergy to make the most of their opportunities. It was felt that East London needed special treatment, and in 1879, on the suggestion of a committee of the A.C.S., Bishop Jackson, then Bishop of London, took the step of appointing a Suffragan Bishop, to whom he entrusted the care of the district, with the title, in accordance with an ancient Act of Parliament, of Bishop of Bedford.

The man selected was Bishop Walsham How, and a happier

selection could not have been made. He spent some time in investigating the conditions of his great task, and came to the conclusion that the great want was living agents. In a place where personal influence was of prime importance, all that was being done failed to provide the means of applying it. He therefore appealed to the Church at large to help him, on the ground that "the average population assigned to each clergyman, there being on an average two to each parish, was upwards of 4,000." "Paucity of labourers," he said, at the Mansion House, "and paucity of funds are the two difficulties which hamper the Church's work in numbers of East End parishes."

The result of this appeal was the foundation of the East London Church Fund, with the aim of invigorating the existing machinery of the Church, and also, where opportunity offered, of fostering varied and experimental efforts in addition to the old parochial system.

The result was soon apparent. The Bishop's unflagging energy and hopefulness on the one hand, on the other the new workers whom he was able to send out, brought fresh energy to many a clergyman who had almost despaired of his task, and created a new standard of Church life, and a new zeal for the Church among the laity of East London. A new era has, in fact, been inaugurated, for the effect of the Fund is felt through the district as a whole, and it is no longer only a parish or a mission here and there, but every parish and district which is in need that is cared for and helped.

So things went on till 1888, when Bishop Walsham How went to Wakefield, and Bishop Billing was consecrated as his successor. By this change the sphere of the East London Church Fund was doubled, for, whereas Bishop Walsham How had been in charge of St. George's, Poplar, Limehouse, Stepney, Hackney and Spitalfields (including Bethnal Green), Bishop Billing was entrusted in addition with Shoreditch, Clerkenwell, parts of Holborn, Islington, and a number of outlying and fast-growing districts in the North of London, up to the borders of Hertfordshire. It was found, on inquiry, that the greater part of this district was in need as great as that of the East End itself. The rural deanery of Shoreditch, for instance, contains probably a larger criminal population than any other district in London. In Islington, again, with its 350,000 people, the Church is in the utmost difficulty—scanty endowments, few vicarages, not enough clergy.

Most Englishmen have been to the great Cathedral which is the central point of all Church of England work in London. There is something truly appalling in looking down from the Golden Gallery of the dome over the interminable billowy sea of

houses which spreads itself in every direction beneath. What incalculable aggregates of poverty, misery, and sin does that vast dusky province of streets present! If you think that in that awful region which lies spread out with its dumb, helpless appeal beneath your feet, there are more than 600,000 children attending elementary schools—more children, that is, than the whole population of Glasgow, or Birmingham, or Manchester—what problems does that alone suggest to the mind! And the heart feels more specially pitiful as it turns towards the grim and monotonous East. There are, of course, parts of the East and North that are pleasant and open, but it is with something of an indignant pathos that the eye glances over the unbroken dreariness of the dwellings of more than a million toilers, of many races and many conditions, but leading a life which cannot be reckoned natural or healthy. Misery and poverty there are in the slums of Westminster and in North Kensington, and in St. Giles; but where else shall be found on so prodigious a scale such congested masses of ignorance, hopelessness, and irreligion? Not that the whole district is the same. I shall presently show of what different masses its population consists; and how cruel and unwarrantable are the exaggerations which have been entertained as to its character; but where else shall we find an area at so dead a level, with a lowness of ideal so uninterrupted, with an outlook so inhumanly uninteresting? Where else can we speak of a population with habits so degraded as in that dismal tract between the soaring spires of Whitechapel and Shoreditch, where from the very nature of the case a long series of the most hideous murders had no chance of being discovered?

The greatest physical evil with which we have to contend is from overcrowding. It lies at the base of almost every other disease, social and religious. So heavy is the pressure of competition for shelter, that amongst the people of whom we are speaking there are very few who spend less than a fifth of their weekly income on rent. The number of families who occupy each a single room has not been accurately estimated, but it is enormous. Not infrequently there are more families than one in the single-roomed tenement. Four shillings is the average rent of one room, six shillings of two. From such a state of things the imagination shrinks back appalled. There is no need to multiply horrors; they have been detailed with point and brilliancy by picturesque writers. The fact is enough. Under such conditions morality and even decency are impossible. The child of these surroundings has never known what is meant by purity.

We do not wonder that in this state of things no very

large number of the population attends church, chapel, or mission-room. A census on any particular day is somewhat misleading, as it is not always the same people who attend public worship on successive Sundays. Still, a census is a rough guide. On October 24, 1886, the Church of England had upwards of 72,359 worshippers, distributed between morning and evening; other denominations, 81,699. These numbers added together give a total of a little over 154,000. No doubt for the Church of England the numbers are considerably under-estimated, as no account is taken of those present at early Communion services or at afternoon services. To this we must add the census of attendance at mission-halls, taken on November 27, 1887. Morning, afternoon, and evening, the Church of England had 5,142 present on that day in those adjuncts to the parish churches, and other denominations 43,443; the total being 48,585. It will give us a rough but not unfair conclusion if we add the mission-hall census to the church and chapel census; and thus we arrive at the result that 202,585 might be supposed to be in church, chapel, or mission-hall on some particular Sunday. The consequent reflection that, in spite of all deductions, there must be something like 700,000 persons who are not often seen inside a place of worship, must give us ground for deep and painful thought. We cannot be surprised that the language of the greater number of those whose condition we are considering is, probably through no fault of their own, redolent of the foulest coarseness and of ceaseless blasphemy. We cannot be surprised that amongst the greater number of the young people prostitution or concubinage is the rule. When in addition to the unhealthy conditions in which from infancy they are steeped, the astounding state of our marriage laws makes matrimony legal for a boy at fourteen and for a girl at twelve, we cannot be surprised to find the majority of marriages reckless and unthrifty, and in a vast number of cases only contracted to cover the coming birth. We cannot be astonished that the one institution which flourishes in East London is the public-house; that it exists everywhere in countless numbers; that men, women and young people drink; that on drink is spent so huge a share of wages which might have gone for thrift and comfort; that side by side with the public-house flourishes the pawnshop; and that directly there comes some depression of trade or want of employment, even those who before were in receipt of good wages habitually and regularly exist on the pledge of their clothes and possessions. There may be good-nature and kindness amongst this great mass of our fellow-citizens, they may be on the whole wonderfully well disposed to obey the

law, but their outlook is dark, their standard of life low, and too many of them can only be described in the words of St. Paul as without hope and without God in the world.

Now, no conscientious Christian who shares with these multitudes the responsibility of being an inhabitant of London can rest quietly in his bed at night without daily making some effort to improve the conditions of this enormous aggregate of life at low level. Yet, when we come to consider the resources of the Church of England in the district we have under review, we cannot but be surprised to find their woeful and lamentable insufficiency. There are in the archdeaconry of London (not reckoning the City), 187 parishes, with an average population of between 6,000 and 7,000 each. But these parishes are of most unequal size. There is one with over 21,000 inhabitants, one over 20,000, one over 19,000, three over 18,000, one over 17,000, two over 15,000, six over 14,000, three over 13,000, five over 12,000, eight over 11,000, ten over 10,000, sixteen over 9,000, and thirteen over 8,000. It would be idle to pretend that these parishes are not deplorably deficient in church accommodation and in ministerial supply. And the disproportion of income is no less astounding. The average income of the 187 parishes, with an average population of 6,000 or 7,000, is the wholly inadequate sum of £346 a year. Even under the most favourable circumstances, such a sum is small indeed when we consider that on it the parish minister is expected to be the pioneer in every good work, to support innumerable associations and institutions of usefulness, to make his house a pattern of happy social life, to support a wife who has herself come from a bright and cultured home, and is his energetic supporter in all that is noble, and to educate a family according to the requirements of an age of stern and unrelenting competition. But when to this we add the surroundings of East End life, the absence of all joy and beauty except that which is spiritual, the dull streets, the dismal canopy of cloud and smoke, the smallness of the available contributions of the congregation, the total absence of friends who can help, the agonizing struggle to overtake the neglect of past generations, then indeed our acquiescence in the sufficiency of such a stipend appears to be heartlessly cruel. The facts of the case are worse than the average. Of parish incomes between £400 and £500 there are 23; between £300 and £400, 60; between £200 and £300, 64; between £150 and £200, 1; of £150 and below, 5—and no less than 71 of these parishes are in the lamentable condition of having no parsonage provided for the vicar. It is true that a considerable number of curates are found for the district by the

Bishop of Bedford's Fund, the Bishop of London's Fund, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, the Pastoral Aid Society, and the Additional Curates' Society. Great would be our shame if this were not the case. Here and there, too, provision is being made for an endowed curacy; but this does not alter the lamentable insufficiency of our maintenance for the parish clergy. In the hardest and most engrossing part of the whole Church of England, they are the worst paid. Without funds for the maintenance of their churches, without funds for the comfort and happiness of their services, without funds for the support of their schools, without funds for the countless missionary enterprises amongst the dark surrounding masses of heathendom which invoke their energies, without funds for the ordinary relaxations of life, we expect them to promote civilization, to keep back the tide of barbarism, to evangelize the multitudes, and to lead lives of heroic and unrewarded self-sacrifice. Is it too much to hope that our great Church funds and associations, having now for the most part built the churches, should arouse the wealthy to the duty of providing decent and fitting means for carrying on the work? There are vast numbers of men who fish, ride, shoot, hunt, yacht, travel, dine, and dance, who need stint themselves for nothing, and whose life is one long series of amusements, who can hardly tell what to do with their money. They know nothing of these facts which so affect the population amongst which they live. Is it too much to hope that they may be stirred to do what they could so easily achieve to remedy these necessities?

After ten years' work, the Bishop of Bedford and his council, in looking back on the results of the time during which the East London Church Fund has been in existence, were able to tell us that they discerned a great awakening of the conscience of England to the truth about life in our great centres of population, an honest eagerness to know the facts of the case, and an earnest readiness to do whatever seems to be unquestionably beneficial. They discerned improvement in the methods of philanthropy, and a growing conviction of the necessity for helpful legislation, which may secure better conditions of life for those among whom the Church is set to labour—legislation which shall remove some, at least, of the obstacles which now stand in her way, and hinder the people from receiving her message and joining in her worship.

Under the two successive Bishops of Bedford, and their able successor, the Bishop of Stepney, the good work of those who were struggling on against tremendous odds, before the fuller help came, has been wonderfully developed. The supply of clergy and other resident Church-workers has been con-

siderably increased, and has substituted for the weakness, caused by felt isolation and realized helplessness, a strong spirit of hope and resolute determination. As a result, the parish church has become more generally the home of the people; while additional services, larger congregations, increased numbers presented for Holy Baptism and Confirmation, and a growing appreciation of the benefits of Holy Communion, attest the revival of religious life.

And there is one sign of good sense and experience with which we must all sympathize—instead of the excessive subdivision of parishes, there has been a wider use of the mission-room, without separation from the mother church, under which policy neglected neighbourhoods have become active centres of missionary enterprise; while in other instances, where subdivision was clearly the best course, mission districts have been formed, and have grown into fully-organized parishes.

Ten years ago we had in East London no East London Church Fund, no Diocesan Deaconess Homes, no Oxford House, no Toynbee Hall, no college or public school or county missions, no ladies' settlement in Bethnal Green. With all these has come renewed efficiency. And now the Church, rejoicing to see a readier acceptance of those spiritual gifts which, through the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, God offers to His people, rejoices, too, that her social activities also have their own reward. Preaching a present as well as a future salvation; gladly taking in hand whatever will promote the welfare of the mind and body, as well as of the spirit of men, of women, and of children; demonstrating here that a workmen's club need not be a centre of unlicensed drinking, of gambling, or of the degrading exhibitions of the prize-ring, but can be a healthy centre of self-improvement, of rational amusement, and of brotherly feeling; demonstrating there that the loud antagonist of Christianity can be put to silence by calm discussion, and that the honest doubter can be led tenderly forwards into light; proving that open-air preaching can be redeemed from an imperfect or distorted representation of Divine truth; labouring to improve the dwellings of the poor, and labouring also to effect that improvement of character, without which no dwelling can become a home—the Church, being now better understood than before, is daily growing in influence and power. Blind to no difficulty, no danger, no evidence of past mistakes, the kingdom of God in East London grows gradually wider; and if those whose duty it is to extend that kingdom go steadily forward, and, in reliance upon the Holy Spirit, use all the means at their command for furthering this work, without fear and without

fuss, what reason is there why the next ten years should not be, by God's mercy, even more rich in blessings than the last ten years have been? What reason is there why the Church in East London should not go on with progress sure, though slow, overtaking the arrears, which through force of circumstances, rather than of fault, have been accumulated; meeting the fresh needs of rapidly-growing populations as they arise; devising new methods of activity, as the requirements of the day may demand; but ever holding up the Cross, as the symbol of all that is good for man, in the face of prejudice, ignorance, unbelief, indifference, and sin; witnessing for Christ, through poverty or antagonism, with all earnestness and loyalty, until it be felt in every street and alley and court that "He lives who once was slain," to be the Saviour, Lord, and Friend of the poor as of the rich, of the lowly as of the great, in all the kingdoms of the world?

"After sixteen years of experience," says the recent report—"experience not untouched by anxiety, and yet blessed with many signs that God recognises the work of which they are the humble instruments as His own—the council enter upon the labours of another year with confident hope and a quiet trust in the ability of the Church to deal with the vast problems that lie before her. Replying to the question whether he thought the Church had influenced the masses, the Bishop of London recently said: 'I ask, what has touched them more? Has the Government been more successful with them? Have the police? Does the Board School reach them, or, when it does, does it improve them *au fond*? The Church reaches the masses better than anything I know.' Gratefully do the council acknowledge the efforts made, and made successfully, by the State and by individuals, whether personally or by association, for the happiness and improvement of the great multitudes of the East End; but they know that the only real force is the power of the living Christ."

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

Short Notices.

Registrum Sacrum Anglicanum. By WILLIAM STUBBS, Bishop of Oxford. Second edition. Pp. 248. Price 10s. 6d. Clarendon Press.

The Church of England is under a deep debt to the learned Bishop of Oxford for his historical and constitutional researches. The first edition of this work was published in 1858, so that this appears nearly forty years later. It contains a list, as far as possible complete, of every English consecration of a bishop since St. Augustine, with the consecrating