

the sin does not seem to have troubled the consciences of bishops or clergy at all. Even good and otherwise conscientious men were not disturbed by it. A few instances will illustrate what has been said.

Bishop Newton, on his appointment to the see of Bristol, which he held in conjunction with the deanery of St. Paul's, complains plaintively of all that he had to surrender, viz., a living in the city, a prebend of Westminster, the precentorship of York, a lectureship at St. George's, Hanover Square, and the genteel office of sub-almoner.

Bishop Beilby Porteus held a country living in conjunction with the bishopric of Chester, and had permission to retain the important living of Lambeth as well. Happily, he "did not hesitate a moment" to give up this last into other hands. Bishop Hoadley held the see of Bangor for six years, and never saw his diocese in his life. Bishop Watson, of Llandaff, lived permanently in the lake district, and turned his attention to literature and farming. In connection with his bishopric he received the tithes of no less than sixteen different parishes, in only nine of which he kept a resident curate. With such an example before them, it is small wonder that many of the parochial clergy were also pluralists and non-resident, and terribly remiss in all pastoral duty. We read, for instance, the complaint: "The clergyman does not come near the people from Sunday to Sunday. He just comes to read the service, and when it is done the horse is ready at the hatch to carry him off." The modest suggestion of Bishop Secker, in 1741, to the clergy of the Diocese of Oxford reveals the sad infrequency of the celebration of the Holy Communion: "One thing might be done in all your parishes—a sacrament might easily be interposed at that long interval between Whitsuntide and Christmas. If afterwards you can advance from a quarterly communion to a monthly, I have no doubt you will." The bishop also reminds the clergy that "our liturgy consists of evening as well as morning prayer, and no inconvenience can arise from attending it, provided persons are within tolerable distance of church."

Two great evils especially attended upon this chief evil of pluralities and of non-residence—the exceeding poverty of the unbeneficed clergy, and the general loss of the sense of personal responsibility attached to the receiving of emolument. The bishops and so-called higher clergy, with their accumulated endowments, were wealthy, aristocratic, and unapproachable. Bishop Hurd, the trusted friend of George III., lived at Hartlebury castle, one-quarter of a mile from Hartlebury church, yet he seldom went that distance except in the episcopal chariot, attended by servants in full-dress liveries. It is related of Bishop Warbur-

ton by a contemporary admirer that "He was beyond measure condescending and courteous, and even graciously handed some biscuits and wine in a salver to the curate who was to read prayers." On the other hand, Thomas Stackhouse, curate of Finchley, writing of the "inferior" clergy in and about London, says that they were objects of extreme wretchedness. "They lived in garrets, and appeared in the streets with tattered cassocks. The common fee for a sermon was a shilling and a dinner; for reading prayers twopence and a cup of coffee!" Happily this wretchedness was very largely removed as the century advanced.

Of the other evil, it is scarcely possible to speak too strongly. The eighteenth century may be said to have almost destroyed the sense of personal responsibility. An instance of the utter lack of it, which would be amusing if it were not the symptom of a grave public disorder, is found in Bishop Watson's anecdotes of his own life. He tells it of himself, or we should find it difficult to believe. In 1764, when only twenty-seven years old, Watson, by "the kindness of the university," was unanimously elected professor of chemistry at Cambridge, though, as he naively confesses, "I knew nothing of chemistry, had never read a syllable on the subject, nor seen a single experiment in it"

A few years later, at the age of thirty-four, his university was even more kind towards him. He was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity. His knowledge of theology does not seem to have excelled his knowledge of chemistry. "I determined to study nothing but my Bible, being much unconcerned about the opinions of councils, fathers, churches, bishops, and other men as little inspired as myself." When anxious questioners appeared, the professor tells us that he was wont to deal with them after a short and easy method. "I never troubled myself to answer their arguments, but used on such occasions to say to them, holding the New Testament in my hand, '*en sacrum codiceni.*'" Possibly the plan was no less prudent on his part than simple. After a few years he appointed a deputy to lecture in divinity, and employed himself in supporting the religion and institutions of his country, in building farm houses, blasting rocks, enclosing wastes, making bad land good, and planting larches "in the beautiful district on the banks of Winandermere." A useful life, but scarcely one for which a professorial chair at Cambridge or the episcopal see of Llandaff was founded.

As the sense of responsibility died away, the idea of privilege and prosperity grew into its place. The pew system was extended to country churches, and the position of the poor made more dependent and uncomfortable. That this was an innovation in that day appears from a letter of Horace Walpole, who speaks of the absence of pews in the churches as one