HOW HIGH WAS HE?
THE RELIGIOUS THOUGHT AND ACTIVITY OF EDWARD FEILD, SECOND CHURCH OF ENGLAND BISHOP OF NEWFOUNDLAND (1844-1876)

SHERRI SANDERSON

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-33450-8
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-33450-8

How High Was He?

The Religious Thought and Activity of Edward Feild,

Second Church of England Bishop of Newfoundland (1844-1876)

by

© Sherri Sanderson

A thesis submitted to the

School of Graduate Studies

in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Religious Studies

Memorial University of Newfoundland

July 2007

St. John's Newfoundland

Abstract

For over thirty years, in the middle of the nineteenth century, Edward Feild served as second bishop of the Church of England diocese of Newfoundland, which included the Archdeaconry of Bermuda. His episcopate lasted from 1844-1876, years of great turmoil in the colony and in the church. Although he was in the midst of it all, he is barely remembered today. Feild is best known today for his educational and political activities, but his religiosity was at the core of his being and motivated his thought and actions. Feild was not simply a High Churchman, he was a Tractarian, and his Tractarianism had great consequences for his episcopacy and pastoral leadership. Not only was he a follower of the Oxford Movement, he also followed the tenets of the Cambridge Camden Society, the Cambridge Movement, in order to bring concrete expression to his Tractarian sacramentalism in church architecture and design. Feild's Tractarianism can be found in all of his writings, most especially, the seven published Charges to the clergy of Newfoundland and Bermuda. These texts are crucial to an understanding of Feild's religious views since the bishop's charge expressed what was of greatest concern at the time of its deliverance. Feild's Tractarianism in his Charges was intimately related to his Church of England ecclesiology as well as his views on worship and liturgy, the sacraments, and church architecture. Feild's Tractarian ecclesiology is shown by his defence of the church as a supernatural institution, and his efforts to exclude the secular world from its governance. Concerning the worship of the church, Field's Tractarianism insisted upon following established authorities and the rules of the Church of England as found within the *Book of Common Prayer*. Through the immense importance that he gave to the sacraments and their administration, Feild exemplified his Tractarian

sacramentalism. In his ever-abiding concern for church architecture, as shown through his interest in church design and construction throughout the diocese, Feild concretely expressed his Tractarianism and his belief in the architectural ideals of the Cambridge Movement. This thesis involves both historical criticism and interpretation in order to determine Bishop Feild's religious thought and actions through an analysis of seven of his key ecclesiastical texts and the recreation of the historical context in which he can be situated.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank my advisor, Dr. Hans Rollmann, for his guidance, instruction, encouragement, and insight. The depth of his scholarship has been greatly appreciated.

Thank you as well to the rest of the Religious Studies faculty at Memorial who have encouraged me throughout my time at the university. Special thanks to Mrs. Mary Walsh who has assisted me with administrative matters and listened when I needed someone with whom to talk.

Thanks to my friends, both in St. John's and away, who have listened to me and given me confidence whenever I needed it. Finally, thanks to my mom who has supported me, both financially and emotionally, throughout the course of my life.

Quotations from the Biblical text are taken from the New International Version (NIV) of the Bible.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 Introduction

Although there are schools, roads, and buildings named after him in Newfoundland and England, people of today know very little about Bishop Edward Feild. The embodiment of the Church of England in the Diocese of Newfoundland (including the Archdeaconry of Bermuda) for over thirty years, surprisingly little scholarship exists about him, and he has not been given a scholarly biography. Edward Feild was bishop of Newfoundland from 1844-1876, which were years of much upheaval in Newfoundland, some of which he was involved in, or helped to create. The years of his episcopate were by no means quiet, but both productive and controversial as far as the history of the Church of England and of Newfoundland is concerned.

Edward Feild was born on 7 June 1801, in Worcester, England, and died 8 June 1876, in Hamilton, Bermuda, "in the 76th year of his age, the 51st of his ministry, and the 33rd of his Episcopate."[1] Feild was educated at Rugby, and then at Queen's College, Oxford. It was during his time at Queen's that his High Church sympathies grew when he studied divinity under the very popular Dr. Charles Lloyd, Regius Professor of Divinity. Lloyd was later bishop of Oxford and ordained Feild as a priest in 1827. Feild was at Oxford at the same time as other future members of the Oxford Movement and even competed for an Oriel Fellowship (unsuccessfully) with, among others, Frederick Oakeley and Robert Isaac Wilberforce, two of its prominent members.[2] His first parish was at Kidlington and, in 1833, he left that church when he became rector of English Bicknor in Gloucestershire. He brought about considerable improvements to both

---

[1] Owsley Robert Rowley, *The Anglican Episcopate of Canada and Newfoundland* (Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1928), 217.

[2] John Henry Newman to Jemima Mozley, Oriel College, 28 February 1826, *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman*, ed. Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall, vol. I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), 278.

parishes, as he raised money from his friends, repaired the churches, and introduced and reformed the schools. It was in 1844 that the Bishop of London approached Feild and offered him the colonial bishopric of Newfoundland. Feild was not quick to accept and only did so "when appealed to as a builder, an organiser, a teacher, and a paternalist;" all things needed in his future position.[3] He was consecrated bishop on 28 April 1844, at Lambeth Palace, with the consecration sermon given by his clerical friend Reverend Richard Davies. Feild left England on 4 June 1844 and arrived in St. John's on 4 July of that same year. The situation in which Feild found himself upon his arrival in Newfoundland was not one congenial to his religious sympathies as most of his clergy were Evangelical. This eventually changed and, by the end of his episcopacy, it was rare to find a Low Church clergyman in the diocese. Most of his clergy had followed the bishop into Tractarianism, or at least into sympathy for the religious thought and practices of the Oxford Movement. Throughout his life, Feild cared little for public opinion; he stuck firmly to his beliefs and was not swayed by any considerations of favour or dislike. He refused negotiation on issues of church doctrine or discipline and "permitted no compromise in matters which seemed to him to threaten the religious ... position of the Church of England."[4]

The Historical and Religious Context of Newfoundland and Bermuda

At the time of Feild's arrival in his diocese, the history of Newfoundland was both long and short; Europeans knew of it even before Cabot's 1497 voyage, but it had

[3] Frederick Jones, "The Making of a Colonial Bishop: Feild of Newfoundland," *Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society* 15, no. 1 (1973): 10.
[4] Elinor Senior, "Feild, Edward," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online,* general editor Ramsey Cook, http://www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=39101&query=field (accessed 24 July 2006).

not become an official British colony until 1824. The succeeding decades were chaotic ones for the new colony. The crucial period in the political history of Newfoundland was that between 1825 and 1855, beginning with its gaining colonial status in 1825, the granting of representative government in 1832, and its attainment of responsible government in 1855.[5] Newfoundland was divided on ethnic and religious lines, and this division was reflected in the colony's politics. The mainly Irish Roman Catholics and the mostly English Protestants had strong feelings about the governing of Newfoundland, and they seldom agreed. Protestantism in Newfoundland consisted of the Church of England, Methodists, and small numbers of other denominations. Unlike England, the Church of England was not the established church of the colony; however, the governors of Newfoundland favoured it above the other denominations on the island. Catholics opposed especially the semi-established status of the Church of England in Newfoundland. In this, they followed their bishop, Michael Anthony Fleming, who brought to Newfoundland the anti-British, anti-Protestant point of view that he had developed in his Irish homeland.[6] Before Feild arrived in 1844, although Catholics and Protestants opposed each other, Protestants had generally stuck together. After this time, Newfoundland Protestantism split between followers of Feild's Tractarianism and the Evangelical Protestants, within and without the Church of England. Moreover, once the makeup of the Church of England was no longer Erastian and Low Church in nature, other Protestants were no longer willing to tolerate any state favouritism of the Church of England.[7]

---

[5] John Carrick Greene, *Between Damnation and Starvation: Priests and Merchants in Newfoundland Politics, 1745-1855* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999), 7.
[6] *Ibid*, 270.
[7] Jones, "Making of a Colonial Bishop," 31.

Separated from Newfoundland by over sixteen hundred kilometres was the island of Bermuda. Although trade between these two islands was active, they were formally joined together through religion. The Archdeaconry of Bermuda became a part of the diocese of Newfoundland in 1839, when it was created from the colonial bishopric of Nova Scotia. Colonized by English settlers in 1609, Bermuda became a crown colony under a governor in 1684. The Church of England was the established church of the island, so the parish system was in place, and nine churches were constructed by 1700.[8] The first bishop to visit Bermuda was Bishop John Inglis, who made a voyage to the furthermost part of his immense diocese in 1828. At that time, the archdeacon of Bermuda was Aubrey George Spencer, future bishop of Newfoundland.[9] Bermuda had been part of the diocese of Newfoundland for less than one hundred years when it moved from an Archdeaconry to a full-fledged diocese in 1917.

When Feild was consecrated bishop of Newfoundland in 1844, he became the second bishop of that diocese. The diocese had been created only five years before, from the diocese of Nova Scotia, due to the impossibility of one bishop overseeing such a large area. Previously Newfoundland was an Archdeaconry, under the direct supervision of Archdeacons George Coster and Edward Wix. This new diocese was widespread geographically, comprising as it did the island of Newfoundland and the nearby coast of Labrador, as well as the island of Bermuda, 1,200 miles distant. Spencer was the first bishop of Newfoundland, and, even though his tenure as bishop was a short one, from 1839 to 1843, he accomplished much. For the first time, the island came under the

---

[8] Henry Paget Thompson, *Into All Lands: The History of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701-1950* (London: SPCK, 1951), 125.
[9] Henry C. Wilkinson, *Bermuda from Sail to Steam: The History of the Island from 1784 to 1901*, vol. II (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 468, 814.

personal supervision of a bishop. Unlike the Tractarian Feild, Spencer was an Evangelical, and the priests whom he recruited were Evangelical as well.[10] One of these was the American, Robert Traill Spence Lowell. Lowell articulated his evangelical concerns in a mystery novel and in verse, most especially in *The New Priest in Conception Bay*. Spencer met Lowell at Harvard, in 1842, and Lowell followed Spencer to Bermuda later that year. Lowell was ordained in Bermuda and, in May 1843, went as a missionary to Bay Roberts in Newfoundland. Lowell remained in Bay Roberts until 1847, when he returned to the United States. This was three years after the Tractarian Feild took over as bishop, and Lowell's leaving Newfoundland was at least partially due to the two men's incompatible religious outlooks.[11] During his episcopate, Bishop Spencer strengthened the evangelical tendencies of his diocese. Church services elevated preaching, and there was no great emphasis on ceremonial. Liturgical and devotional variations of local practice were tolerated and the Church of England was somewhat of a decentralized body. Moreover, Spencer cooperated with non-Church of England fellow Evangelicals in areas of mutual pastoral concern and in several Protestant voluntary associations. Spencer did not insist that all power be centered in the position of the bishop. The shift from Spencer to Feild was quite a shock to the diocese of Newfoundland; moving as it did from "Spencer's gracious and aristocratic latitudinarianism to Feild's intensive policy."[12] Feild brought order to his diocese, but at the cost of no longer tolerating differences allowed by Spencer.

---

[10] For more information on the topic of Evangelicalism in Newfoundland, see Heather Russell, "Evangelicalism in the Anglican Church in Nineteenth-Century Newfoundland," (M.A. thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 2005).

[11] Hans Rollmann, "Lowell, Robert Traill Spence," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online,* general editor Ramsey Cook, http://www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=40364&query=lowell (accessed 2 October 2006).

[12] Wilkinson, *Bermuda From Sail to Steam*, 672.

Previous Scholarship

There has been some scholarly work done on Feild but what exists has mainly concentrated on his political or educational activities; his own religious thought and actions have only been examined at a surface level. In 1877, a year after his death, the first and only full-length biography of Feild was published.[13] It was not written by a disinterested scholar, but by one who had known Feild, by Henry Tucker, the assistant secretary to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Church of England organization supporting missionary work in Newfoundland. The memoir is typical of nineteenth-century biographies in that it is a work of hagiography more than history. A second work of hagiography is that published in 1896 by Charles Mockridge.[14] It chronicles the lives of Church of England bishops to 1896 and includes a section on Feild as the second bishop of Newfoundland.

Although the focus of the proposed thesis will be on Bishop Feild's religious thought and actions as shown in his Charges to his clergy, it is important not to ignore Feild's achievements in education. A history of the development of Queen's College, the theological institution built up by Feild, is found in the 1898 work by Curling and Knapp, principals of the college at different times in the 1890s.[15] There are two master's theses that deal with Bishop Feild and education. The first was written in 1972 by Mary Sheldon and has as its subject the early history of denominational education in Newfoundland and,

---

[13] Henry William Tucker, *Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of Edward Feild, D.D., Bishop of Newfoundland, 1844-1876* (London: W. W. Gardner, 1877).
[14] Charles Henry Mockridge, *The Bishops of the Church of England in Canada and Newfoundland: Being an Illustrated Historical Sketch of the Church of England in Canada, as Traced Through Her Episcopate* (Toronto: F. N. W. Brown, 1896).
[15] Joseph Curling and Charles Knapp, *Historical Notes Concerning Queen's College, St. John's, Diocese of Newfoundland, 1842-1897* (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1898).

in particular, the role of the Church of England.[16] Edward Lear, who wrote the second thesis in 1986, deals directly with Bishop Feild and his influence on denominational education in Newfoundland.[17]

To date, the most substantial work on Feild is that by Frederick Jones, written thirty-five years ago, in 1971, as a Ph.D. dissertation on the bishop's involvement in politics and religion during the nineteenth-century.[18] The bulk of Jones's thesis deals with the interweaving of politics and religion in Newfoundland. If Jones had paid more attention to Feild's religious thought and his theological influences, it would have helped him to a better understanding of *why* Feild acted in the public sphere as he did. Jones also published a number of articles dealing with both Feild and nineteenth-century Newfoundland, and some, but not all, of these articles seem to have originally been part of his dissertation. The most recent scholarly work on Feild is the master's thesis of Calvin Hollett.[19] Hollett was primarily interested in Harbour Buffett in the years 1845-1857, when the mainly Evangelical inhabitants resisted their new bishop. He took a case study approach in his thesis in order to show local opposition to Feild. Since the purpose of Hollett's thesis was to study the opposition to Feild's Tractarianism, the opposition is treated in detail, but Feild's Tractarian thought is not.

A thesis on Feild's religious thought as a Tractarian needs to pay attention to the Tractarians themselves. Many works have been published on the Tractarians and the

---

[16] Mary Sheldon, "The Establishment of the Denominational School System in Newfoundland with Particular Reference to the Role of the Anglican Church 1836-1876" (M.A. thesis, University of Toronto, 1972).
[17] Edward James Lear, "Edward Feild (1801-1876), Ecclesiastic and Educator: His Influence on the Development of Denominational Education in Newfoundland" (M.A. thesis, Bishop's University, 1986).
[18] Frederick Jones, "Bishop Feild, a Study in Politics and Religion in Nineteenth-Century Newfoundland" (Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1971).
[19] Calvin Hollett, "Resistance to Bishop Edward Feild in Newfoundland, 1845-1857, Harbour Buffett: A Case Study" (M.A. thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 2002).

Oxford Movement. Important for understanding the Oxford Movement are the writings of the Tractarians themselves, specifically their ninety *Tracts for the Times*.[20] Two early histories of the Oxford Movement are by R. W. Church and Yngve Brilioth, published in 1891 and 1933 respectively.[21] More recently, Owen Chadwick has published a number of works on the Oxford Movement and on the Church of England, most specifically *The Mind of the Oxford Movement* and *The Victorian Church*.[22] Although not an easy read by any means, the best book on the Oxford Movement in the past twenty years is, in my judgement, Peter Nockles's *The Oxford Movement in Context*.[23] This 1994 work situates the Oxford Movement in both its historical and theological contexts. The Oxford Movement was not without precedent in the Church of England. Nockles establishes its continuity with the past, and profiles those features that were truly unique. By examining literature on the Oxford Movement and its leaders, one gains a deeper understanding of Feild's religious thought. The literature points out the sacramental emphases, the value of tradition, and the promotion of the Church of England as the exponent of true Christianity, held by members of the Oxford Movement. These recurring themes match Feild's emphases in his religious thought and activities, as can be observed in his seven Charges to the clergy. His great concentration on church architecture also illustrates and reinforces the sacramental nature of his religious thought. Feild's pedagogical proclivities, his determination that the Church of England educates its own children,

---

[20] "Tracts for the Times," *Project Canterbury,* http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/index.html (accessed October 3, 2006).
[21] R. W. Church, *The Oxford Movement: Twelve years, 1833-1845* (1891; reprint, ed. and with an introduction by Geoffrey Best, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970); Yngve Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival: Studies in the Oxford Movement* (New York: Longmans, Green, 1933).
[22] Owen Chadwick, *The Mind of the Oxford Movement* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1963) and *The Victorian Church*, 2 vols. (London: SCM Press, 1987).
[23] Peter Benedict Nockles, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

demonstrate yet another facet of his understanding of the Church of England as the exponent of "true Christianity."

Attention must also be paid to works on the Cambridge Movement, since Feild's great interest in church architecture shows his affinity with that movement. The first modern work to concentrate specifically on the Cambridge Movement, and not conflate it with or subsume it under the Oxford Movement, was James White's *The Cambridge Movement.*[24] The book, published in 1962, seems more interested in debunking the work of the Cambridge Camden Society rather than examining its links with Oxford, as well as what the society was attempting to accomplish. Another major work on the Cambridge Movement, by Nigel Yates, was published in 1991, and then revised in 2000, the same year as Christopher Webster and John Elliott's work on the movement.[25] Yates' work did not focus only on the Cambridge Movement but covered the years 1600-1900. It is nevertheless quite valuable for its discussion of the liturgical arrangement of Anglican churches throughout these years. As opposed to White's work, the study of Webster and Elliot sought to make the most of new scholarship on the Victorian period in order to bring forward a considered view of the society's influence. In order to understand the writings of Bishop Feild, it is necessary to understand the leading ideas of the Oxford and Cambridge Movements, since both profoundly influenced Feild's own thinking.

Charges to the Clergy

This thesis will be focussing primarily on the seven published Charges to his

[24] James F. White, *The Cambridge Movement: The Ecclesiologists and the Gothic Revival* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962).
[25] Christopher Webster and John Elliot, eds., *'A Church as it Should be': The Cambridge Camden Society and its Influence* (Stamford: Shaun Tyas, 2000); Nigel Yates, *Buildings, Faith, and Worship: The Liturgical Arrangement of Anglican Churches, 1600-1900*, rev. ed. (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2000).

priests, who had gathered on four occasions in Newfoundland and on three in Bermuda.[26] It is important to remember that a bishop's charge was not given to the clergy on just any occasion. Since clergy would rarely gather as a whole, such occasions were special, as were the contents of the charge. Only that which was of greatest concern to the bishop at the time of its deliverance would have been included in his charge. Feild, himself, saw in this literature an instruction "how rare in occurrence, how grave in its purpose, and how much may reasonably be expected in it both of advice and encouragement."[27] By examining a bishop's charge, especially Feild's, one is able to discover what he considered to be of the utmost significance at a particular point in time. Subjects that appear throughout several of his charges dealt with issues that he held in highest regard and whose significance to his religious thought were dominant and of abiding concern. Feild's first Charge was given shortly after his arrival in his diocese in 1844 and the last in 1866, twenty-two years later. The Charges are important for a study of Feild's religiosity since they reflect the local and international situations of the time, his religious views and his ecclesiastical concerns.

Methodology and Scope

This thesis is a work of both historical criticism and interpretation since it aims to discern the meaning of texts and reconstructs historical contexts in order to determine the religious thought and actions of Bishop Feild. Past works on Feild and his thought have often been works that were driven by hagiographic adulation and reproduced largely Feild's own theological agenda rather than being historical-critical in character. Others

[26] Newfoundland: 1844; 1847; 1858; 1866, Bermuda: 1849; 1853; 1866.
[27] Edward Feild, *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland, June 25, 1866, and Printed at Their Request* (London: Rivington, 1867), 3.

have narrowed their scope of inquiry to politics and education without seriously raising the question of Feild's ideological guiding interests. This thesis makes an effort to understand Feild's religious thought and action through a close reading of his published and unpublished writings and by historical contextualization, especially by comparison and contrast to his contemporaries. As in other areas of intellectual history, a critical reading of Feild's literary oeuvre and unpublished correspondence will make informed judgements on authorship, date, content, literary character, intentions, expected audience and reception history.[28] More than any other form of literature, Feild's Charges betray the imprint of the period and the intellectual environment that informed his writings. It is through an awareness of Church of England theology and the ecclesiastical needs of Newfoundland and Bermuda as well as the wider socio-political context within which the nineteenth-century Church of England operated that thinking patterns and ecclesiastical intentions are discerned.[29] Closely connected with the author's intent and thought forms is an awareness of the audience to whom the work was addressed. It is not enough to simply identify the religious themes and instructions advanced by Feild but one also needs to take seriously into account the specific circumstances and expectations of his addressees as well as the relations of mutual dependence that existed between the bishop, his clergy, and the parishioners. By such a principled inquiry into Feild's seven Charges and other writings, this thesis situates Feild in the social conditions of the nineteenth century, elucidates the religious thought and ethos that moved him, brings out the interactions that existed between Feild, his clergy and the laity, and sheds new light on

[28] For methodological issues in church history, see: Roger Aubert, *Church History in Future Perspective* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1970) as well as James E. Bradley and Richard A. Muller, *Church History: an Introduction to Research, Reference Works, and Methods* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).
[29] For definitional and historiographical issues relating to the Oxford Movement see Chadwick, ed., intro. to *Mind of the Oxford Movement,* 61-64; and especially Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 1-43.

the nature of Feild's Tractarianism as the principal ideology that informed and moved his religious thought and activities.

In order to accomplish these goals, the thesis has been divided into five chapters. It begins with a chapter of background on the Oxford and Cambridge Movements, since some knowledge of both are necessary to the religious thought of Bishop Feild. Members of the Oxford Movement, or Tractarians, held, among other things, to a reliance on church authority and tradition, the independence of the church from all outside institutions, and a high regard of the sacraments. Although it was frequently conflated with the Oxford Movement in past scholarship, the Cambridge Movement refers specifically to that begun by the Cambridge Camden Society, which stimulated an interest in Gothic church architecture. Members of the society felt that it was necessary to look beyond theology to "a new approach to the liturgy and the design of churches" if the doctrines of the Oxford Movement were to be fully put into practice.[30] The Cambridge Movement might not have existed without the Oxford Movement, but it was a distinct movement in architecture and church design.

The second chapter discusses Feild's conception of the Church of England and his attempts to realize that conception within his diocese. It points out how, as a Tractarian, Feild saw apostolic succession as the mark of a true church. The place of the Church of England was that of a middle point between the Roman Catholics and the Wesleyans, and the chapter shows how Feild and John Henry Newman developed this concept. Following this, is a discussion of how Feild's conception of the Church of England made it necessary for the church to be an independent entity free from government control,

[30] Christopher Webster, ed., *'Temples...Worthy of His Presence': The Early Publications of the Cambridge Camden Society* (London: Spire Books, 2003), 13.

legislatively and in matters of finance. This chapter concludes with a discussion of education and cooperation. According to Feild, it was the duty of the Church of England to take responsibility for the education of her children, and to do so, Feild had no scruple to become involved in local politics. As well, the church could not be part of any association that included what Feild considered invalidly ordained clergy or non-members, most particularly Wesleyans.

The third chapter centers upon the worship and liturgy of the Church of England, as understood by Feild. It begins by stressing the vital nature of Christian worship before entering a discussion of the importance of tradition versus reason and the necessity of using established authorities for a nuanced knowledge of Christianity. As a typical Tractarian, Feild promoted a return to the *Book of Common Prayer* and a closer observance of the rules of the Church of England. A discussion of various aspects of church liturgy, from public church worship services to preaching and sermons, finishes this chapter.

The fourth chapter focuses upon Feild's religious understanding of the sacraments as celebrated by the Church of England. He upheld a Tractarian understanding of the sacraments and sought to bring about such an understanding among his clergy. The sacraments of the church were for Feild the means by which God's grace was revealed and communicated to his people, and of these baptism and communion were supreme. It was not the sermon that was paramount, but the sacraments and their proper administration - not the pulpit, but the altar. Feild explained the correct manner of their administration and answered controversies concerning them. The chapter begins with baptism, before turning to confirmation, and then communion, confession, and marriage,

as understood by Feild.

The final chapter treats church architecture in Feild's diocese. This chapter flows from the previous one on sacraments since the patterns of worship sanctioned by Feild's Tractarianism were revealed in, and depended on, the internal and external architecture of the churches in his diocese. As the emphasis in church services changed from preaching to the administration of the sacraments, the focus in church buildings changed from the pulpit to the altar. Increased attention was given to the doctrine and practice of the Eucharist, which resulted in church renovation and different ways of constructing new churches. Feild erected many churches within his diocese and made sure that their construction followed the tenets of the Cambridge Camden Society. Churches were consecrated for the glory of God, and their design and construction needed to reflect the principles of the society and his Tractarian spirituality. This chapter first discusses the exterior design of churches in general before moving to the specific case of the Cathedral of St. John the Baptist in St. John's. It concludes with the bishop's understanding of the internal design, construction, and furnishing of churches.

Not Your Typical High Churchman

During his time as bishop, Feild published much and was active in a number of different spheres. However, it is impossible to understand him without bringing his religion into the equation. By paying attention to Feild's religious thought and his theological influences, one obtains a more nuanced view of the motivations behind Feild's actions. Through an examination of seven of his Charges to the clergy, as well as his remaining writings, the religious thought and actions of Feild can be determined, and then placed theologically into its historical context. The bishop was a very determined

man who arrived in Newfoundland with his theological understanding in place and his long episcopate did nothing to deter him from this. This understanding was not simply that of a High Churchman but of a Tractarian and expressed itself through his religious thought and activities.

Unlike the first Tractarians, Feild was not based at Oxford but was out in the world, in charge of a parish and then a diocese. His Tractarianism was not just theoretical, but was also practical. It found expression in parish and diocese, through publications, pronouncements, and church construction. With construction, he was helped immensely through his knowledge of the tenets of the Cambridge Camden Society and his active correspondence with the society and friends who shared his ideals. Unlike Newman, Oakeley, and others, Feild's high religious understanding did not compel him to convert to Roman Catholicism in order to realize his religious ideals. He held a sacramental understanding of Christianity, but his valuing of tradition meant that he did not turn away from a reliance on the *Book of Common Prayer* and the rules of the Church of England. When he had become bishop, Feild always considered it part of his duty to his people to remind them of those laws and ordinances.[31] As the Oxford Movement taught, the Church of England was the exponent of true Christianity in the nineteenth century, and Feild never wavered from this point.

Although he was able to accomplish some reforms in his parishes of Kidlington and English Bicknor, Feild's scope widened exponentially once he became bishop of Newfoundland. Since the Church of England was not the established church of Newfoundland, it was to some extent free from the influence of the state. This assisted

---

[31] Edward Feild, *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland by the Bishop, at his Second Visitation, on the Feast of St. Matthew, September 21, 1847* (Bermuda, n. p., 1849), 21.

Feild in all of his labours to build up the Church of England, to organize it around the person of the bishop, and to ensure that it became strong, and remained independent from all outside influences.[32] Although Feild was a sacramentalist and insisted on the sacraments of baptism and communion as necessary for salvation, that did not mean he imposed a particular theological understanding of controversial sacramental issues upon his clergy or the laity. It was more important for him that the clergy realized the necessity and administration of the sacraments, rather than giving a positive conceptual declaration of their doctrinal content.[33] Feild's Tractarianism lay at the core of his being, and he believed that all within his diocese should hold this understanding of the Church of England. He had a very elevated understanding of the episcopate and he worked tirelessly to ensure that the Church of England clergy and laity comprehended this as well. This took much time to accomplish, since the diocese was Low Church in nature upon the bishop's arrival, but the transformation was completed by the end of his episcopate. Feild's Charges to the clergy of Newfoundland and Bermuda not only illustrate his Tractarianism and show how this understanding underlay his religious thought and all of his activities, but also became the effective means for instructing his clergy in Tractarian ecclesiastical policies and principles.

[32] Frederick Jones, "John Bull's Other Ireland – Nineteenth-Century Newfoundland," *Dalhousie Review* 55, no. 2 (1975): 230.
[33] Edward Feild, *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland on St. John Baptist's Day, M.DCCC.LVIII* (St. John's: John T. Burton, 1858), 35.

Chapter 2 Two Oxbridge Movements

The turbulent nineteenth century gave rise to many religious movements that affected the course of English society and that of its colonies. Priests, scholars, and architects alike sought for ways to reform the Church of England. Two reform movements within the church that strongly affected Christian life and action were the Oxford Movement and the Cambridge Movement. These movements sought ways to revitalize the church and raise its doctrinal temperature, as well as raising the ecclesiastical temperature of all members of the Church of England, clergy and laity. The two movements demonstrated a rebirth of interest in the sacramental elements of worship and sought out ways whereby the church could return to her early Christian roots, combined with a full use of the *Book of Common Prayer*.[34] As will be seen, members of the Oxford Movement relied upon church authority and tradition, believed in the independence of the Church of England from all outside institutions, and, especially, had an elevated regard for the sacraments. The Cambridge Movement brought these and other aspects of the Oxford Movement into concrete expression through church building and renovation, as well as stimulating an interest in Gothic church architecture. The movements were children of their day, thus the historical context is necessary for any understanding of the either movement, and the figures within them.

The Oxford Movement

In the 1830s and 1840s, a movement of Catholic revival spread from the University of Oxford to the rest of England and beyond. The Oxford Movement did not

[34] Colin Cunningham, *Stones of Witness: Church Architecture and Function* (Stroud, England: Sutton, 1999), 197.

occur in a vacuum but drew on many previous influences in its development. Although the movement quarrelled vociferously with Evangelicals, it can be considered a successor to the Evangelical Movement since both were movements of the heart rather than the head. Both opposed the contemporary Church of England, which did little to nourish the souls of its membership. Those who belonged to the Oxford Movement believed that it was impossible to approach dogma solely through the exercise of reason since dogma was inextricably intertwined with worship, tradition, and the experience of the numinous.[35] While human reason had value, it was not the most important aspect of the life of the individual; nor was it appropriate that reason replace faith in the exercise of Christianity.

The Oxford Movement was one of restoration in that it sought to return to the Catholic roots of the Church of England. It bypassed the church of the eighteenth century and discovered the last gasp of the authentic church in the Caroline divines, or Nonjurors, so-called because of their refusal to take the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy to William and Mary, having already sworn such oaths to James II and his successors. Their period of activity was a short one, beginning in 1688 and concluding with the death of Queen Anne in 1714.[36] The divines held to a liturgy that celebrated ancient piety, even more so than the spirituality of the Reformers. Most importantly for the Oxford Movement, the Nonjurors believed in the critical importance of episcopacy. Another principle professed by the Nonjurors that was vital for the Oxford Movement, and of the High Church in general, was that of the *via media*, the Church of England as the middle way between the Roman Catholic Church and the churches of the Reformation. This

---

[35] Chadwick, ed., intro. to *Mind of the Oxford Movement,* 11.
[36] Kenneth Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth Century to the Late Twentieth Century* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1993), 71, 80.

principle pre-dated the Caroline divines as it originated with Richard Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, published in 1594-1597. Hooker, 1554-1600, stressed that the Church of England was "a branch of the Church universal, neither Roman nor Calvinist, but at once Catholic and Protestant, with a positive doctrine and discipline of its own."[37]

It is important to remember that the High Church movement in the Church of England did not vanish with the demise of the Caroline divines, before re-emerging with the Oxford Movement. Two successors were the Hutchinsonians, active in the years after the Hanoverian Succession, and the Hackney Phalanx, the latter group connected to the former by personal ties, and most active between 1805 and 1828.[38] In those years, the Phalanx dominated headships at the Oxford and Cambridge colleges, royal chaplaincies, archdeaconries, and the episcopate.[39] The future leaders of the Oxford Movement would have encountered the Phalanx during their years at Oxford, and its decline after 1828 saw the rise of the Oxford Movement.

A more immediate influence on the thought of the leaders of the Oxford Movement, however, was the Regius Professor of Divinity, Dr. Charles Lloyd.[40] After attaining his professorship, Lloyd gave private lectures on divinity to graduates of Oxford, which continued even after he became Bishop of Oxford. In 1823 and 1824, John Henry Newman and Edward Bouverie Pusey were among his students and - somewhat later - were Richard Hurrell Froude and Edward Feild. In his lectures, Lloyd stressed the continuity of the *Prayer Book* services with those of the medieval church. He outlined the

---

[37] *Ibid*, 10.
[38] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 13.
[39] *Ibid*, 271.
[40] 1784-1829; Oxford first in 1806; February 1822 appointed to regius professorship; 15 August 1822 married Mary Harriet Stapleton; consecrated Bishop of Oxford 4 March 1827. William J. Baker, "Lloyd, Charles (1784-1829)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16822 (accessed 28 November 2006).

development of the liturgy from its original sources through the Roman Missals and breviary and concluded with prayers used in the current Church of England.[41] The Church of England in the nineteenth century was by no means divorced from its Catholic roots. They were present, although not emphasized, in the liturgy of the contemporary church. In the person of Dr. Charles Lloyd, three of the future leaders of the Oxford Movement, Newman, Pusey, and Froude, were exposed to Catholic thought and writings.

John Henry Newman, John Keble, Edward Bouverie Pusey and the lesser-known Richard Hurrell Froude were the acknowledged leaders of the Oxford Movement, a movement that was spiritual in nature and represented a turning away from the growing secularism and rationalism of the time.[42] This latter was achieved through an emphasis upon the sacraments of the Church of England, and by valuing highly the traditions of the church, especially those of the pre-Reformation church. In order to regain its original balance between Rome and Geneva, the long devalued Catholic side of the Church of England needed recovery and a return to its rightful position and significance within the church. Although all leaders of the Oxford Movement were spiritual in character, they brought more than that to the table. Newman's strength was also intellectual, Keble's pastoral, Pusey's devotional, while Froude supplied fire and energy.[43]

Of the four leaders of the Oxford Movement, Froude is today remembered the least. In spite of this, and although he was alive for less than thirty-three years, his influence on the movement cannot be underestimated. [44] Without him, it is doubtful

---

[41] William J. Baker, "Hurrell Froude and the Reformers," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 21, no. 3 (1970): 247.
[42] Also Charles Marriott, Henry Edward Manning, Frederick Oakeley, William Ward, and Issac Williams.
[43] Chadwick, ed., intro. to *Mind of the Oxford Movement*, 48.
[44] 1803-1836; 1824 graduated BA Oriel College, Oxford; 1826 elected Oriel Fellow; 1827 gained MA; winter of 1832–3 travelled to the Mediterranean with Newman; 1833 to 1835 in Barbados for his health; died of tuberculosis 28 February 1836. Piers Brendon, "Froude, (Richard) Hurrell (1803–1836)," in *Oxford*

whether Keble and Newman would have enjoyed close intimacy, and their repayment was the editing and publishing of Froude's *Remains* in 1838, two years after his death from tuberculosis.[45] Froude's influence on his fellow leaders in the Oxford Movement manifested itself in a number of ways. He disliked the Reformation immensely and believed that the English Reformers lacked the proper reverence for the Church of England. Froude looked at the Reformers through the lens of his personal views of moral excellence and the nineteenth-century crisis within the Church of England; he paid scant attention to the particular moral, political, and theological situation of the Reformers.[46] He also believed that the church had lost its authenticity after the Nonjurors and was willing to accept the disestablishment of the Church of England. The latter point was of great importance, especially for Keble.[47] Froude had a very high conception of the sacraments, and especially the Eucharist with its vital position in the life of the church. He was also involved in the *Tracts for the Times* and wrote three or four of them himself (9, 59, 63, and possibly 8).[48]

John Keble, along with several other Oxford Movement leaders, was a Fellow of Oriel College.[49] About a decade older than his three friends, "his own persona was the chief link between the Oxford men and the high churchmen of 1688."[50] Unlike Froude, Newman, or Pusey, Keble had not attended Dr. Lloyd's divinity lectures. He was

---

Dictionary of National Biography, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10203 (accessed 28 November 2006).

[45] Piers Brendon, "Newman, Keble and Froude's *Remains*," *The English Historical Review* 87, no. 345 (1972): 697. Richard Hurrell Froude, *The Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude*, edited by John Henry Newman and John Keble (London: Rivington, 1838).

[46] Baker, "Hurrell Froude and the Reformers," 254.

[47] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 82.

[48] Piers Brendon, *Hurrell Froude and the Oxford Movement* (London: Elek, 1974), 141.

[49] 1792-1866; 1831 elected professor of poetry at Oxford; vicar of Hursley from 1836 until his death. John Taylor Coleridge, *A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble, M.A., Late Vicar of Hursley*, 4th ed. (Oxford: James Parker, 1874).

[50] Chadwick, ed., intro. to *Mind of the Oxford Movement*, 33.

nevertheless imbued with Anglo-Catholic ideals through his upbringing. Although Keble spent much of his time away from Oxford, he remained deeply involved in the actions of the movement. Indeed, it was his Assize Sermon of 14 July 1833 in which he decried Parliament's actions regarding the Church of England in Ireland, that has been traditionally considered the starting point of the Oxford Movement. He was much concerned with sanctification and developed a theology centered on the Eucharist that involved a more frequent reception of the sacrament, and an increase in the number of Eucharistic services.

Edward Bouverie Pusey was born in 1800 and died in 1882. Influenced by Dr. Charles Lloyd, he spent 1826-1827 studying theology in Germany. From 1829 on, he occupied the chair of Regius Professor of Hebrew for over fifty years.[51] While Pusey eventually became the public face of the Oxford Movement, he did not at first join with Newman, Keble, and Froude. His first contribution to the Movement was his 1834 tract on fasting in the *Tracts for the Times*. Up to this point, all tracts had been anonymous, but Pusey signalled his participation in the Oxford Movement by signing his tract with his initials.[52] He brought a gravitas to the movement and changed the format of the *Tracts* from being brief pamphlets to long texts. On 14 May 1843, this scholar preached a university sermon, *The Holy Eucharist: a Comfort to the Penitent*, which became a stumbling block for his opponents and crystallized the theological convictions of the Oxford Movement. In his sermon, Pusey emphasised the doctrine of the real presence. Although quite distinct from the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, it was

---

[51] Henry Parry Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey: Doctor of Divinity, Canon of Christ Church, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford*, ed. J. O. Johnston and Robert J. Wilson, 4th ed., 4 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, 1894-98).

[52] David Newsome, *The Parting of Friends: The Wilberforces and Henry Manning* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), 163.

confused with it by his opponents. He was condemned without a hearing for preaching doctrines contrary to the Church of England and suspended for preaching before the university for two years.[53] The doctrine of the real presence was difficult to define and attempts such as Pusey's to do so ended after misunderstandings and a storm of condemnation. This controversy was not to go away anytime soon.

In the past, whenever the Oxford Movement was discussed, it was firmly linked with the thought and career of John Henry Newman. Its influence was thought to end with Newman's 1845 Roman conversion.[54] Although Newman's conversion is no longer recognized as marking the end of the Oxford Movement, he remains a principal figure in the movement. John Henry Newman, 1801-1890, began life in a home that looked to the Bible for inspiration. At Oxford, he was introduced successively to rationalism and the Anglo-Catholicism of Dr. Charles Lloyd.[55] Like many other adherents of the Oxford Movement, he was part of Oriel College and as a leading light in the Oxford Movement from 1833 until 1845 he was involved in all of its major issues. He was solely, or partly, responsible for publishing many tracts, books, and letters to various newspapers. Newman received a blow to his position as a member of the Church of England in 1841 when various bishops of the church censured and then condemned *Tract 90*, an attempt to show that the Protestant Thirty-Nine Articles could be interpreted in a Catholic way. Newman took his condemnation personally and felt that this "episcopal disowning" was a humiliation.[56] He turned from an understanding of the Church of England as the

---

[53] Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, vol. 2, 4th ed. (London: Longmans, Green, 1894), 306-7, 331.
[54] See Church's Oxford Movement and Marvin R. O'Connell, *Oxford Conspirators: A History of the Oxford Movement 1833-45* (New York: Macmillan, 1969).
[55] John Henry Newman, *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*, ed. David DeLaura (New York: Norton, 1968). This is a very valuable edition of the spiritual autobiography and contains much supplemental material.
[56] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 295.

repository of Christian truth to one that saw truth principally within Roman Catholicism. He left the Church of England on 9 October 1845 and spent the remainder of his life in the Roman Catholic Church, where he became a cardinal and seminal theological influence to future generations of theologians.

In 1827, John Keble published *The Christian Year*, a volume of verse that joined Romanticism with Church of England piety. It was a devotional text and contained poems for the Sundays and feast days of the church year. This work was immensely popular and it was *The Christian Year*, rather than Keble's Assize Sermon of 1833, which Pusey considered the origin of the Oxford Movement.[57] Between 1827 and 1833, three actions by Parliament helped to advance the movement. These were the repealing of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828, the passing of the Catholic Emancipation Bill in 1829, and the passing of the Reform Act in 1832.[58] Because of these legislative changes, dissenters and Catholics were eligible for Parliament and, thus, able to legislate for the Church of England. Parliament was no longer the lay synod of the Church of England, and the Church of England had no sway over the actions of Parliament. Unfortunately, Parliament still had much power over the Church of England since it was the established church of the land and, as such, was not independent from the state. Parliament continued to bring forward legislation concerning the Church of England, although that legislation did not necessarily keep the interests of the church in mind.

The traditional beginning of the Oxford Movement was John Keble's Assize Sermon given on 14 July 1833. The immediate cause of this sermon was an action taken

---

[57] Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, vol. 1, 270.
[58] John Moorman, *A History of the Church in England*, 3rd ed. (London: A. and C. Black, 1976), 330-1. See also Owen Chadwick, *The Victorian Church*, vol. 1, *Part One: 1829-1859*, 3rd ed. (London: SCM Press, 1987).

by Parliament that changed the position of the Established Church of Ireland and threatened the autonomy of the church. In a clear example of Erastianism, the notion that the Church of England was only a human institution and subservient to the secular interests of the state, Parliament sought to reorganize the church in Ireland and, in the process, suppressed ten Irish bishoprics solely on practical and fiscal grounds and without regard to the divine nature of their office.[59] Members of the Oxford Movement, however, did not consider the Church of England to be a human institution, but a divine one, with its episcopal government in the succession of the apostles. It was not the place of the secular government to legislate on religious matters; they were the province of the church and of the church alone. There was concern within the Church of England that reform in Ireland would soon be matched by reform in England. The title of Keble's sermon was "National Apostasy," and the dangers of Erastianism were central to this work.

Less than two months following the sermon, on 9 September 1833, three tracts were published in a series called *Tracts for the Times*, the first public utterances of what was later called the Oxford Movement.[60] The name Tractarian and Tractarianism came from the series of publications, *Tracts for the Times*. Christopher Benson, then the Master of the Temple, a title given to the priest of that church in remembrance of its historical connection to the Knights Templar, in a sermon given at the Temple church in 1839, first used this title for the authors of the series.[61] The *Tracts*, numbering ninety in all, were appeals to forgotten or little known doctrines, and to the history of the Church of England. The *Tracts* were not written by a committee but by individuals and aspired to no uniformity of style or doctrine. The very first *Tract* was a defence of apostolic

[59] Baker, "Hurrell Froude and the Reformers," 252.
[60] Church, *Oxford Movement*, 80.
[61] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 36.

succession, and the other two concerned the Catholic Church and thoughts regarding alterations to the liturgy of the Church of England. Newman wrote the first three tracts and twenty-seven altogether. Keble and Pusey each wrote eight, while John William Bowden and Archdeacon Harrison wrote five each, with three each by Richard Hurrell Froude and Isaac Williams.

The Oxford Movement increased in popularity without much opposition until 1838. This all changed with Newman and Keble's publication of the private writings and diaries of their friend, the late Richard Hurrell Froude. Beginning in 1838, Froude's literary remains were published in two parts in four volumes. It marked the beginning of opposition to the Tractarians from High Churchmen, hitherto their allies.[62] Newman and Keble were aware of the outcry that the publication of the *Remains* would raise, due to its strongly positive view of Roman Catholicism and its denigration of the English Reformation, but they were not deterred. Publishing Froude's writings was their celebration of his life, and their position as editors made Froude's pronouncements the "official apologia" of the movement.[63] It is fair to say that, in the minds of Newman and Keble at least, Froude was the first martyr of the Oxford Movement.

The Tracts for the Times began in 1833 and concluded with *Tract 90* in 1841. There is no doubt that the series would have continued if it had not been for the controversy, opposition, and condemnation surrounding the publication of the final tract. *Tract 90* endeavoured to show that the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, although originating in a time of great antipathy to Catholics, were not uncatholic.[64]

---

[62] *Ibid*, 281.
[63] Brendon, "Newman, Keble and Froude's *Remains*," 705.
[64] Thirty-Nine Articles: defined Church of England doctrine over against that of the Roman Catholic Church and dissenters.

Newman wrote *Tract 90* to show that the Articles could be "subscribed to by those who aim[ed] at being Catholic in heart and doctrine."[65] He was anxious to show that the Articles were not as anti-Catholic as had generally been believed in order to retain followers of the Oxford Movement who had become dissatisfied with the Church of England and were looking longingly towards Rome.

After Newman retired to Littlemore in 1842, the Romeward movement became increasingly visible through the public utterances of William G. Ward and Frederick Oakelely.[66] Like other Roman sympathizers, Ward followed Froude in his dislike for the Reformation and felt that the Church of Rome was a practical model of the ideal Christian church. It was not only a model, but unlike the Church of England, the Church of Rome held, for Ward and others such as Oakeley, the only expression of authentic Christian doctrine existing in the contemporary world. In 1844, Ward articulated his beliefs in *The Ideal of a Christian Church Considered in Comparison with Existing Practice*. The authorities at Oxford condemned this book in the following year, and Ward was stripped of his MA degree. These actions, however, did not sway him from his path, and he joined the Roman Catholic Church in September of 1845.[67]

Newman followed Ward to Rome one month later, and his secession marked the end of a chapter in the Oxford Movement. Nevertheless, it did not mark its demise. Although two of the leaders of the movement were now gone, Keble and Pusey were left. Under Pusey's leadership, Tractarianism continued and even widened its scope of influence. The movement moved from being a society of scholars at Oxford to the

---

[65] Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, vol.1, *Part One: 1829-1859*, 183.
[66] Newsome, *Parting of Friends*, 286. See also Wilfrid Philip Ward, *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement* (1889; reprint, Harnborough, England: Gregg International, 1969).
[67] Ward, *William George Ward*, 326, 365.

parochial level, and spread from England worldwide through the efforts of Church of England missionaries and colonial bishops.[68] These years were beset with continual controversy and by public opposition, outcry, court challenges, and slow change. The 1850s were marked by two court cases involving particular doctrinal understandings of the sacraments: the Gorham baptism controversy of 1850 and the 1857 case of George Anthony Denison involving the real presence of the Eucharist.[69] Most controversial in the 1860s was a more vigorous application of reason to Biblical truths. This was exemplified by the 1861 *Essays and Reviews* battle and the writings, and later, the court case, involving Bishop Colenso of Natal. These issues, as well as the ritualism controversies of the 1860s and 1870s, were characteristic of the life of the movement after Newman.[70]

In reaction to the one-sided emphasis on reason in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the Oxford Movement sought to re-instil a sense of reverence and awe into the life of the Church of England. Newman, and his fellow leaders, felt that a reverential spirit was needed above all else. Linked with that was "a finer appreciation of the sacramental system as the guardian of the fundamentals of the Christian faith."[71] The Tractarians supported their concepts from church history so that the Oxford Movement appeared as a movement of restoration of past truth and not as something entirely new. They believed in the independence of the church from all outside institutions, held to a reliance on church authority and tradition, and had a very high regard for the sacraments.[72] The Tractarians recognized their uniqueness as *via media* and sought to

---

[68] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 302.
[69] *Ibid*, 11.
[70] For a good overview of the period, see Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, vol.1, *Part One: 1829-1859*; and Owen Chadwick *The Victorian Church,* vol. 2, *Part Two: 1860-1901,* 2nd ed. (London: SCM Press, 1987).
[71] Newsome, *Parting of Friends*, 185.
[72] See Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, vol. 2, 140, for Pusey's own summary of Tractarianism.

reassert the long-ignored Catholic side of the equation.

In sermons, lectures, and publications, Tractarians asserted the independence of the Church of England over against the Erastianism of the state. The Oxford Movement began due to this Erastianism, with regard to the Church of Ireland, and the Tractarians saw Parliament repeatedly taking actions that served to diminish the status of the Church of England. To counteract this, the Oxford Movement brought the doctrine of apostolic succession to the fore. The Church of England was not a human establishment because God decreed episcopacy and, thus, the church should not be subservient to the material interests of a secular state.[73] The interconnection between church and state had broken after 1832 when dissenters, Roman Catholics and, potentially, atheists, could take their place in Parliament. The Reformation had not cut the strand of apostolic succession in the English Church so that the bishops of the nineteenth century could trace their lineage back to the apostles of Jesus. The Tractarians raised the concept of apostolic succession to even greater heights through their belief that it was through the episcopate that the efficacy of the sacraments was validated. Proper administration of the sacraments and preservation of correct doctrine came through the true episcopate of the Church of England.[74] Because dissenters did not have an episcopal government, Tractarians found it impossible to cooperate with them.

Tractarians raised the appeal to tradition in opposition to the dissenters and their evangelical principles of *sola scriptura* as well as the employment of only private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture. For Tractarians, "the Church is to teach, the Bible to prove," since the Bible was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to provide

[73] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 53.
[74] Brilioth, *Anglican Revival*, 180.

proof for doctrine developed by the church. [75] The appeal to tradition was not to any point in the later history of the church but to the ancient and undivided church. The teachings of the church fathers and formularies of the church, such as the catechism and the creeds, exemplified this. Antiquity was the "standard and final court of appeal, rather than ... a corroborative testimony to the truth of the Church of England's formularies and the teaching of her standard divines."[76] Tradition was the lifeblood of the church, but the ancient church was favoured more than the English Reformers. The early Tractarians gained their dislike of the English Reformers through the influence of Froude. This influence spread after the publication of his *Remains*, although not all Tractarians denigrated the Reformers or their beneficial influence upon the life of the Church of England. Those Tractarians who disregarded the English Reformers gained weight for such a diminution through a Canon of 1571 that "enshrined the principle that preachers were to conform their teaching to 'the Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops.'"[77] Those who held absolutely to this Canon, considered the early church to be of more importance for the Church of England in the nineteenth century than the church of the Reformation.

Tying the valid administration of the sacraments to apostolic succession elevated the status of the sacraments in addition to the doctrine of apostolic succession. Two of the sacraments, those of baptism and the Eucharist, were essential for every member of the church, as they were necessary for salvation. An individual could increase in devotion and holiness through the divinely appointed sacraments and ordinances of the church.[78] Pusey was greatly concerned with the sacrament of baptism and wrote *Tract 67* on that

---

[75] Chadwick, ed., intro. to *Mind of the Oxford Movement*, 37.
[76] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 114.
[77] *Ibid*, 118.
[78] James C. Livingston, *Modern Christian Thought*, vol. 1, *The Enlightenment and the Nineteenth Century*, 2nd ed. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997), 180.

topic. Baptism gave the soul its spiritual birth and brought about regeneration, from which came the baptismal regeneration enshrined in the *Book of Common Prayer.*[79] This particular understanding of baptism, with its great emphasis on the importance of the sacrament caused controversy with Evangelicals who did not have the same elevated understanding and considered conversion a focal point of Christian existence. Just as the sacrament of baptism brought about the spiritual birth of the soul, the Eucharist was the spiritual food of the soul. Since this was the case, frequent communion was necessary for the soul's health. The Tractarians were dissatisfied with the infrequent celebration of the Eucharist that was current practice in the Church of England and fought for weekly, if not daily, communion. Their understanding of the sacrament rejected the memorialism of the Anabaptists as well as the transubstantiation of the Roman Catholics in favour of a doctrine of the "real presence" that they saw enshrined in the prayer book.[80] Although the Tractarians explicitly denied any Roman Catholic definition of the "real presence," their opponents did not make such a distinction between the two doctrines.

The high sacramentalist theology of the Tractarians inevitably found concrete expression in their churches. Churches no longer had the same status as secular buildings and holy places gained reverence. The service of consecration was a concrete expression of the unique status of the church. Once a building underwent consecration as a church for the glory of God, it was removed from common uses for all time. Although the Tractarians were not mainly concerned with the visible part of devotion, as was the Cambridge Movement, their regard for it did increase. Church interiors were adorned and decorated and, as Pusey made known in 1840, such a visible aspect of devotion as

[79] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 231.
[80] *Ibid*, 238.

decoration of the house of God was significant because, among other reasons, it acted "insensibly" on the mind.[81]

The Oxford Movement was of great importance in the history of the Church of England, but its significance did not rest upon any idea that it was the first High Church Catholic movement in the Church of England; for it certainly was not. The Oxford Movement continued many of the themes that developed in the past, and its legacy was the raising of the doctrinal and ecclesiastical temperature of the Church of England. The Tractarians brought to the church "a unique combination of moral strength and religious dynamism, imbued with the spirit of Romanticism" so that the Oxford Movement was able to capture hearts as well as minds.[82] While it appeared that on the surface of the Oxford Movement there was public dissention and disfavour, beneath all of this was a strengthening of the soul of the Church of England. Newman, Keble, Pusey, and Froude were all failures as public men, but their status as moral guides remained quite secure. They showed, in themselves, ideals of a sacramental and ascetic life and "sent out to the English religious conscience a call which sounded through the country."[83]

The Cambridge Movement

Although frequently conflated with the Oxford Movement in past scholarship, the Cambridge Movement refers specifically to the one begun by the Cambridge Camden Society.[84] This society stimulated interest in Gothic church architecture throughout England and beyond. Members of this society felt it necessary to look beyond theology to "a new approach to the liturgy and the design of churches" if the doctrines of the Oxford

[81] Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, vol. 2, 140.
[82] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 325.
[83] Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, vol.1, *Part One: 1829-1859*, 231.
[84] They were also called ecclesiologists after ecclesiology, the study of church building and decoration.

Movement were to have their full expression.[85] This new approach was one of heightened sacramentalism, with the centrality of the sermon replaced by an increased understanding of the vital significance of the sacraments. Architectural reform did not stand alone since it developed out of reforms in liturgy and worship introduced by the Oxford Movement. Members of the Cambridge Movement clearly understood that rearranged church furniture could never support an unchanged liturgy.

In 1839, two Cambridge undergraduates, Benjamin Webb and J.M. Neale, with the help of Webb's tutor at Trinity, Archdeacon Thomas Thorp of Bristol, formed the Cambridge Camden Society.[86] Thorp was President of the society, Webb one of the secretaries, and Neale its first chairman. It was established for "the study of Church architecture and the promoting of restorations on sound 'ecclesiological' principles."[87] Those "sound" principles were the ones promulgated by the Tractarians. Gothic architecture was the preferred style in church restoration, seen through the prism of worship and liturgy. While Gothic was the architecture of the time, Webb and Neale also drew inspiration from developments outside the Church of England, including A.W.N. Pugin's writings and buildings for Roman Catholic patrons.[88] Not only did the society examine past churches, it promoted church restorations and new building schemes, the latter two based on ecclesiological principles gleaned from the past, and articulated by the Tractarians. The ideals of the society spread through the publication of pamphlets that put

---

[85] Christopher Webster, ed., introduction to *'Temples... Worthy of His Presence': The Early Publications of the Cambridge Camden Society* (London: Spire Books, 2003), 13.
[86] Oxford had its own society concerned with architecture- the Oxford Society for Promoting the Study of Gothic Architecture, founded in 1839. The society at Oxford was interested in many aspects of Gothic architecture, including old bridges and manor houses. The interest in Gothic architecture was not religious but antiquarian and academic. White, *Cambridge Movement*, 24, 43.
[87] Elliot Rose, "The Stone Table in the Round Church and the Crisis of the Cambridge Camden Society," *Victorian Studies* 10, no. 2 (1966), 120.
[88] Yates, *Buildings, Faith, and Worship*, 156.

forward principles that those involved in the care and repair of churches should follow.[89] The society gained prominence in both architectural and liturgical fields in the early 1840s, and *The Ecclesiologist* (first issue dated November 1841) assisted this prominence. This journal was best known for its reviews of new and restored churches around the country. These reviews ran the gamut from "fulsome praise to the excoriation of benighted architects," with praise reserved only for those who followed the society's principles.[90] Through *The Ecclesiologist* and various pamphlets, the Cambridge Camden Society became the arbiter of architectural taste with regard to church building and restoration throughout the nation.

Cambridge, and the nation at large, welcomed the society at first, and its membership included men throughout England. In 1842, the last year in which the annual report contained a membership list, members from Oxford included William E. Gladstone and John Keble.[91] Just as 1845 marked a watershed in the development of the Oxford Movement, so it did for the Cambridge Movement. A court decision in the "Round Church" case, the first court case regarding church ritual, was brought on 31 January 1845 (*Faulker v. Litchfield and Stearn*). In 1841, the Cambridge Camden Society had been invited to assist in the restoration of St. Sepulchre, Cambridge ("the Round Church"), and the society's decision to include a stone altar in the church stirred up controversy. The Court of Arches found against the society, and throughout this process, the widespread publicity of the society as champions of Roman Catholic superstition

---

[89] Webster, ed., intro. to '*Temples... Worthy of His Presence,*' 22.
[90] Geoffrey K. Brandwood, "'Fond of Church Architecture'- the Establishment of the Society and a Short History of its Membership," in *'A Church as it Should be': The Cambridge Camden Society and its Influence,* ed. Christopher Webster and John Elliot (Stamford: Shaun Tyas, 2000), 54.
[91] Rose, "Stone Table," 122.

unnerved the general membership.[92] Cambridge University officials were not happy with this publicity, and memberships were dropped by those who had joined the society because it was the socially correct thing to do. The connection with Cambridge was severed in May 1846 when the Ecclesiological (late Cambridge Camden) Society formally constituted itself in London. *The Ecclesiologist* continued as a publication until 1868.[93]

Those involved in the Cambridge Movement understood that a church was different from other buildings, and this difference existed both in function and in form. The ecclesiologists railed against Georgian churches with their emphasis on the pulpit rather than the altar and found them hardly distinguishable from secular buildings. According to the society, "Gothic was the true English national style" unlike "the pagan Italianate forms of the previous two centuries," and it was to the fourteenth century as mediated by the Elizabethan Settlement that the followers of the Cambridge Movement turned.[94] Gothic architecture had arisen in a time of Christian faith and as a response to the needs of that faith. It was hoped that Gothic Revival architecture would do the same, and it was supposed that the "reappropriation of ancient Catholic forms would foster ... a deeper spiritual content" within the people.[95]

Churches designed or restored under the auspices of the Cambridge Movement, moved from focussing on the pulpit to focussing on the altar as the centre of the Eucharist. The pulpit diminished in importance, and was frequently moved off to the side in the nave while the chancel and altar regained lost significance. The addition of a rood

---

[92] *Ibid*, 128, 133-5.
[93] *Ibid*, 141.
[94] White, *Cambridge Movement*, 91.
[95] Dale Adelmann, *The Contribution of Cambridge Ecclesiologists to the Revival of Anglican Choral Worship 1839-62* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 1997), 10.

screen separated the clergy in the chancel from the outside laity, the altar was raised two or three steps to further magnify its importance, and the congregation was seated on uniform benches facing the altar. Through the implementation of these principles, the priest was enabled to celebrate the Eucharist in accordance with the rubrics in the *Book of Common Prayer*. In this way, the Cambridge Movement brought into physical expression the theoretical principles of the Oxford Movement. Other Cambridge Movement emphases were stained glass windows, surpliced choirs placed in chancels, and the substitution of benches for pews.[96] The Cambridge Camden Society set out both the external and internal design of a church; nothing was too minute to escape its attention.

The removal of pews was an ecclesiological principle, surpassed only by the restoration of chancels. Pews were private, physically separated off from the congregation and infrequently utilized. Pews took over much space in a church and relegated the rest of the congregation to benches or to standing room. The existence of pews also divided the congregation and contradicted the principle that all were equal in the sight of God. Ecclesiologists considered them an ugly post-medieval innovation. Since pews did not properly belong in the church, ecclesiologists wished "the complete abolition of all private pews and the substitution of open benches throughout the church."[97] In time, unassigned and free open benches replaced private and closed pews.

The Cambridge Movement was not solely concerned with Gothic Revival architecture as applied to churches, but worked for change on an extensive range of issues. It had a serious commitment to the Gothic style, but as assisted with a greater sacramental emphasis found in the liturgy. The increased emphasis on the sacraments

---

[96] Webster, ed., intro. to '*Temples ... Worthy of His Presence,*' 12.
[97] Yates, *Buildings, Faith, and Worship*, 159.

encouraged a deeper piety in both clergy and laity. Alongside the Oxford Movement, the Cambridge Movement was interested in the applied reform of the Church of England and the restoration of Catholic principles.[98] The greatest impact of the Cambridge Movement did not come when the Cambridge Camden Society was at its highest pitch, but after what many considered its demise. The clear guidelines produced by the society for the arrangement of churches became the way in which churches were ordered and reordered. These guidelines were accepted by a broad consensus of clergy and their architects. The society ceased to exist as a formal entity in 1868, yet from that decade onwards, it was "hard to find a new church [in England] which did not conform to the Society's principles."[99] Moreover, bishops, and others, of the Church of England, took the tenets of the society around the globe, Newfoundland and Bermuda included.

[98] Christopher Webster, "Postscript," in '*A Church as it Should be,*' 349.
[99] *Ibid*, 357.

Chapter 3 The Church According to Feild

Bishop Edward Feild was greatly concerned with issues of financial, legislative, and educational importance relating to the Church of England in England, Newfoundland, and Bermuda. Although he received criticism for interfering in areas outside of his position as bishop, he did not see it that way. Feild saw Christianity, and more specifically the Church of England, as an all-encompassing supernatural entity that had gained legitimate authority from God, and not from the actions of humans. The Church of England received its authority from its descent from the apostles and was the only "true" church left in existence. In this, in his concept of the *via media*, and in the necessity for the Church of England to be independent of government interference, Feild showed his Tractarian beliefs. Not only was it necessary for the church to be self-governing, but Feild's church needed to be self-supporting and remain separate from any associations, educational or charitable, that cooperated with churches outside his own communion, since he feared such cooperation might corrupt the correct expression of the faith.

The Essence of a Church

Although the Church of England is defined in its Thirty-Nine Articles as the congregation of the faithful, it is not true to say that it is a purely human institution that derives its origin or influence from human actions or authority. Feild opposed such an understanding by asserting that "our Church [the Church of England] is the Church of Christ and His Apostles, and ... we are one with them and all true Saints, in faith and

practice."[100] While it may have appeared as if the Church of England had come into existence with the sixteenth century English Reformation, that was not the case according to Feild. The Church in England did not break with the historical church of Christ when it broke with Rome. The Church of England, according to Feild, was both Catholic and Reformed, a *via media*, or middle way, between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. He considered the Church of England to be even more than just a "middle way," but rather "a true branch of Christ's holy Catholic Church, and our ministry the divinely appointed form and method of teaching and preaching the truth of God."[101]

Apostolic Succession: the Mark of a True Church

The link that tied the Christian church from the apostles to the church of Feild's day was her unbroken descent from the former as understood through the doctrine of apostolic succession. Feild understood this doctrine to be the authority of the apostles passed down by those they had ordained to his own time.[102] Valid ministry existed only through apostolic succession, and this succession was important because it was impossible for sacramental grace to exist aside from this ministry.[103] With the importance that apostolic succession had in Feild's writings, he legitimized his high conception of both the status of bishops and of the sacraments.

By the time of Feild, Christianity had been in existence for over nineteen centuries. According to Feild, the teachings of Jesus Christ had not been lost for any time during these centuries and their transmission stood in an unbroken line from the apostles to the present. The fact of apostolic succession made it possible for the Church of

---

[100] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 16

[67] Edward Feild, *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda by Edward Feild, D.D., Bishop of Newfoundland, on Tuesday, in Easter Week, 1866* (Halifax: J. Bowes and Sons, 1866), 8.

[102] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 25-6.

[103] Paul Avis, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 171.

England to assert that its teachings were those passed on from Christ's followers, irrespective of what transpired in the 1500s. Apostolic succession found expression through ordination since it was St. Paul who "ordained men to act in his place and with his authority, and appointed them to ordain others."[104] The purveyors of the succession were the bishops of the church, who were ordained and, in turn, ordained both priests and their fellow bishops. Only those churches that practiced episcopal ordination were inheritors of Christ's authority, all others were invalid. As a bishop, Feild saw himself as a successor to the apostles and, though his elevation of the doctrine of apostolic succession, his position increased in importance and significance. Feild did not uphold apostolic succession to elevate himself, but, rather, he had an elevated conception of the position of bishop because of his view of apostolic succession.

The doctrine of apostolic succession was not unique to Feild, nor was it something introduced by his fellow Tractarians. Traditional High Churchmen believed that the ministerial order of bishops, priests, and deacons had a divine source, felt that church government existed within an episcopal system, and that there was a lineal succession of that episcopate.[105] The Oxford Movement, however, placed a strong emphasis on the sacramental dimensions of church order and the necessity of an apostolic ministry at a time when England experienced considerable social changes and upheavals and the Church of England felt itself under attack. In the rural south and east of England, agricultural labourers rioted and destroyed threshing machines. One of Feild's earliest published works described the dangers surrounding machine breaking.[106] Around the

---

[104] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 26.
[105] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 146.
[106] Edward Feild, *Machine-breaking, and the Changes Occasioned by it in the Village of Turvey Down: A Tale of the Times, November 30, 1830* (Oxford: W. Baxter, 1830).

same time, the Reform Act of 1832 was passed, which, among other things, enlarged the pool of those eligible to vote. The Church of England also had to deal with a Parliament that was no longer the "lay synod" of the Church, composing as it did dissenters and even Roman Catholics. The very first *Tract for the Times*, "Thoughts on the Ministerial Commission," written by John Henry Newman, stressed the holy nature of the ministerial office through apostolic succession, and the seventh *Tract*, also by Newman, was even entitled, "The Episcopal Church Apostolical."[107] Both Feild and Newman found the full measure of Christ's gifts to his apostles in the apostolic ministry and its episcopate.

The concept of apostolic succession was certain to arouse controversy since it asserted that the blessings of Christ were linked only to those churches that had a tangible connection in the form of episcopal ordination with the original church. Reformed and other Protestant churches did not have that link and so were not considered valid conveyors of sacramental grace according to Feild and his fellow Tractarians. Feild answered this Protestant opposition in his Charges to the Newfoundland clergy of 1858 and 1866. The discussion originated in Feild's response to the published sermon *Apostolic Succession is not the Doctrine of the Church of England* by the Rev. E. Girdlestone.[108] In this sermon, Girdlestone attempted to use quotations from English Reformers, such as Archbishop Cranmer and Richard Hooker, to disprove the doctrine, while in his 1858 Charge Feild used those same authorities to prove apostolic succession. In his last Charge, Feild returned to apostolic succession and reminded the clergy of his discussion in 1858. The final Charge emphasized that esteemed Church of England divines from the Reformation until 1866 had stressed the truth of the doctrine of apostolic

[107] "Tracts for the Times," http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/index.html
[108] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 25, 81-4.

succession, its necessity, and its existence within the Church of England. Although the doctrine was not explicit in the Bible, it was enough for Feild that such great authorities as Cranmer and Hooker saw that the doctrine existed from the very beginnings of Christian history. [109]

The *Via Media*: the Place of the Church of England

The unique identity of the Church of England has been hard to define throughout its history. Although it emerged as a church with the English Reformation, it did not completely repudiate its Catholic heritage; nor did it identify itself with any of the Reformed churches of the Continental Reformation, especially those influenced by John Calvin, or of the Reformed Church of Scotland. Although its government was episcopal, it was not part of the Roman Catholic Church. The Church of England stood between Protestantism and Catholicism, in continuity with both, and emphasising either side of its heritage at different times and in different places throughout its history. This position of the Church of England was the *via media*, or middle way. Although first introduced by Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* (1594-1597), the concept reached its greatest height with the Oxford Movement in 1837 and 1838. In these years, Newman published his *Lectures on the Prophetical Office of the Church Viewed Relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism*, after having first worked out his understanding of the doctrine in 1834 with *Tract 38* and *Tract 41*.[110] The tracts took the form of a dialogue between two individuals, a cleric and a layperson. In them, Newman brought forward a number of points, including his assertion that the contemporary Church of England had moved from its root principles. Instead of relying equally on the Articles and the liturgy as found in

[109] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 45-7.
[110] H. D. Weidner, preface to *The Via Media of the Anglican Church*, by John Henry Newman (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), xiv, xxxi.

the *Book of Common Prayer*, the rubrics of the latter were forgotten or ignored. In *Tract 38*, Newman stressed that the glory of the Church of England was its position between the Reformers and the Romanists, being neither one nor the other.[111] The whole history of Christianity, its creeds and doctrines, were part of the Church of England, no matter that those were not explicitly laid out in the Articles, or that some were misinterpreted by the Roman Catholic Church.

Feild expressed the view that the Church of England was a *via media* in a number of his writings. He held that it was "the middle point ... that is the safe resting place."[112] Since it was away from the extremes found on either side, Romanist and Wesleyan, it was in this middle position where truth existed. As Feild saw it, a church that claimed to be the embodiment of historical Christianity contradicted itself by having Rome in its name, not to mention the changes it made to the historical doctrines of Christianity. He also did not consider the Wesleyans to be a church since they came from within the Church of England, were a new entity, and were called by the name of the very human Mr. John Wesley.[113] The Church of England did not expect wide popularity since it was the extremes of any point that drew people. Feild strongly believed in the Church of England as "the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints" and its adherents as "the true disciples of Jesus His Church," yet "they who mistake or mislike the Truth and us will find, on one or the other side, a Creed and professors adapted to their views and congenial to their taste."[114]

Feild understood, and proclaimed, that the Church of England, with its apostolic

---

[111] "Tracts for the Times," http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/index.html
[112] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland ... 1847*, 45.
[113] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 15.
[114] *Ibid*, 12, 16.

succession and its position as *via media*, was the only place to obtain the full fruits of Christianity. Feild's actions on behalf of the church, and his interactions with those outside the Church of England communion during his twenty-two years as bishop had their basis in this understanding. In his first month in Newfoundland, he noted, "the different sects have very little animosity or dispute... [T]he Romanists generally are very quiet and respectful. The Methodists are not particularly evil-minded."[115] This opinion would not last for very long, as Feild could, or would, not compromise his understanding of the nature of the Church of England in order to preserve peace.

Unlike England, Newfoundland had not established the Church of England; too many in the colony were adherents of Roman Catholicism and Methodism for this to be at all feasible. The Roman Catholic Church shifted into a very aggressive period in the decade or so before the arrival of Feild when Michael Anthony Fleming became its bishop. Fleming was an adherent of ultramontanism, which removed authority from local secular authorities and centered it exclusively in the local bishop as the representative of Rome. He linked this ultramontanism with an effort to achieve civil rights and recognition for his Irish Catholic flock. Catholics became more conscious of their status and relations with non-Catholics became strained.[116] This policy of Catholic consciousness-raising continued under John Mullock, bishop from 1847-1869, and his awareness of Catholic prerogatives did not endear him to Feild.

A dislike, or fear, of Roman Catholics was prevalent throughout England and in Newfoundland, as the mass of people believed Catholics held exclusive allegiance to the pope. Many of the changes that Feild attempted to bring about in the practices of the

[115] Feild diary, 2 August 1844, McCord Museum. Montréal.
[116] Greene, *Between Damnation and Starvation*, 5, 8.

Church of England in Newfoundland and Bermuda evoked much opposition because of this fear of Roman Catholicism. It did not help that the external ceremonies and practices that Feild introduced, such as daily prayers, private confession, the adornment of the altar to enhance the importance of the Eucharist, and the increased significance given to communion, resembled those of contemporary Roman Catholicism. Feild felt that this similarity to the practice of local Roman Catholic priests was unfortunate since the local Church of England lay people, in addition to some liberal Catholics, had a great "dread and dislike... of the power of the Roman Catholic priesthood."[117] Feild's task of returning the diocese to the Catholic practices of the historical Church of England was made more difficult in the years after 1845 with the widespread publicity surrounding Tractarian converts to Rome. The successions to Rome of Newman and others helped to make the Oxford Movement and its followers synonymous with Roman Catholicism, and those who opposed the latter were sure to do everything they could to oppose the former.

While Roman Catholicism was also linked to Christ through the succession of the apostles, Feild pointed out to his clergy that it contradicted "its own pretensions by the very name of Rome," and, therefore, invalidated its own ministry.[118] If this was the case with Roman Catholics, Feild felt that it was so much more the case with Methodists, or Wesleyans. In England, Wesleyans had also the name and legal status as "dissenters" because they dissented from the established Church of England. Feild and others used "dissenter" in regards to Wesleyans in England and Bermuda, in accordance with British parlance. This was not entirely accurate for Newfoundland, since the Church of England was not formally established in the colony. Since the Wesleyans had only come into

[117] Feild to William Scott, 20 May 1845, Religion in Newfoundland and Labrador Collection. Memorial University of Newfoundland (hereafter cited as RNL Collection).
[118] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII,* 14.

being within the last hundred years through the exertions of John Wesley, there was no descent from Christ and his apostles. Not only that, the line of apostolic succession was broken since their government was not episcopal but congregational. By assuming the name and functions of a church, the Wesleyans were going against the wishes of their founder, who established Methodism as a society within the Church of England, not as separate from it.[119] Newfoundland, through the case of John Hoskins, an eighteenth century lay preacher, had become in fact a stepping stone in the separation of Methodism from the Church of England and its episcopal succession. The refusal of the Bishop of London to ordain Hoskins contributed to the change in Wesley's understanding about the necessity of episcopal ordination.[120] Actions taken regarding a missionary in Newfoundland helped to bring about that lack of episcopal government that Feild found essential for a church.

Feild made it clear that the Wesleyans made up a sect. Having caused dissention and disorder by separating from the true church, Methodism, according to Feild, "assumes the divinely appointed Orders and ordinances of our Church, and propagates their system with all the zeal of separatists."[121] Wesleyan ministers baptized, married, gave communion to their flocks, and in all ways, acted as if they were ministers in the church of Christ. This was anathema to Feild and his fellow Tractarians since they could not see "that these ministers have received any valid authority to perform the functions on which they venture," because of their lack of episcopal ordination.[122] As a result, the Wesleyan ministry was invalid and the grace of Christ could not be found within the

---

[119] *Ibid*, 15, 80.
[120] Hans Rollmann, "John Hoskins of Old Perlican, Trinity Bay," *Early Methodism in Newfoundland*. http://www.mun.ca/rels/meth/texts/origins/earlym8.html (accessed 15 May 2007).
[121] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 18.
[122] William Scott, "The Episcopal Question," *Christian Remembrancer* 5, no. 27 (1843): 358.

administration of the sacraments. Feild informed his clergy that he could not recognize those baptized or married by Wesleyans as being legitimately so. This understanding did not endear Feild to Methodists in Newfoundland or Bermuda, and they were even more upset when Church of England priests re-baptized children previously baptized by Wesleyan ministers.[123] Feild did not mind upsetting Wesleyans, as he was much more interested in ensuring that the Church of England in his diocese was an expression of his understanding of the correct profession of the faith of Christ. Believing as he did that Wesleyans were a breakaway sect of the Church of England who spread dissention and sedition, conspiracy and rebellion, no cooperation or conciliation with them was possible.[124]

Church Governance, or, Who is in Charge?

Sacramental grace could be obtained only from priests who had received a valid ordination. Such ordination was only legitimate when received from bishops who were successors of the apostles. It was through the episcopate that the clergy and the laity received the gifts of Christ. Feild considered episcopacy as the "very essence" of the church since it represented "the regimen or form which God Himself has ordained and consecrated for the guidance and government of His Church."[125] Episcopal ordination was the method employed by the New Testament and the early church, and any other form of ordination was inconceivable. Bishops of the church command, teach, ordain, and discipline, their priests and their people. They are, for Feild, the final arbiter of dispute, but they also hold responsibility for the church's actions within their diocese. In

[123] Frederick Jones, "Early Opposition to Bishop Feild in Newfoundland," *Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society* 16, no. 2 (1974): 34.
[124] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ...1866*, 11.
[125] *Ibid*, 8.

his diocese, Feild was the "Chief Shepherd," and he saw himself as accountable in matters of church order and discipline. Believing that the person of the bishop embodied all power in his diocese, he attempted to move from a system of localized authority to one that was firmly centralized. One example of Feild's activities in this regard was his reorganization, almost a re-founding, of the theological institution in St. John's. He was very careful to reorganize the institution, Queen's College, in such a way that final authority rested with the episcopacy by having the bishop control the college.[126] Throughout his time as bishop of Newfoundland, Feild never acted without keeping his episcopal position in mind. His understanding of the high status of the position of bishop made it impossible for him to consider ever revoking or suspending any "rule and direction as soon as made, at the desire of particular parties or persons."[127]

When Feild referred to various authorities to strengthen his position on apostolic succession and the necessity of episcopal government for the Church of England, he veered away from the traditional refuge of his fellow Tractarians. Instead of relying on examples from the early church, Feild repeatedly used the English Reformation and Bishop Jewel, Archbishop Cranmer and Richard Hooker. Hooker was important because he located the origin of episcopal government with Christ's apostles. In order to prove the case for the importance of the transmission of grace through the episcopacy, Feild quoted Jewel's *Defence of the Apology* (1567), where Jewel had written: "we succeed the Bishops that have been before our days. We are elected, consecrated, confirmed and admitted as they were."[128] By Feild's use of English Reformers to show the vital nature and Tractarian insistence on the episcopate, he advanced the Church of England's sense

[126] Curling and Knapp, *Historical Notes*, 17.
[127] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland ... 1847*, 13.
[128] Quoted in *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 28.

of separation from the churches of the Continental Reformation and the non-episcopal churches within England and its colonies.

State Interference or Self-Government

The Church of England was spiritual, and not of human origin, and existed separate from the state. The governments of England, Newfoundland, and Bermuda, might attempt to regulate the actions of the Church of England, but Feild ignored those regulations when he felt it necessary to do so. In 1866, he pointed out to the clergy of both Bermuda and Newfoundland that Royal Letters Patent could not enact ecclesiastical jurisdiction for colonies that had independent legislatures such as Newfoundland. Although this would seemingly have dissolved Feild's position as bishop of Newfoundland, he was not worried. The clergy accepted him as bishop through the process of "submitting to me their Licences and Letters of Orders" as well as renewing their "promise of canonical obedience."[129] This he found sufficient to legitimize his position, irrespective of the state's recognition of him as bishop. Feild felt justified in ignoring secular legislation because he was convinced that he had consensual jurisdiction, as found in the actions taken by the clergy within the diocese.[130]

The decision by the Privy Council that Royal Letters Patent regarding ecclesiastical jurisdiction were *ultra vires,* came about from the judgment in the Colenso court case. William Colenso was the first bishop of Natal. He was liberal in theology and believed that it was not necessary for polygamous Zulu converts to put away their wives before baptism. This view denigrated the seriousness of post-baptismal sin and the salvific nature of baptism. He was in conflict with other Church of England missionaries

[129] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 31.
[130] Tucker, *Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of Edward Feild*, 220.

for this as well as his view of Zulu culture through the lens of natural religion. As a result of Colenso's very liberal position on the subject of baptismal regeneration, Bishop Gray, metropolitan of South Africa, tried him for heresy in 1863.[131] The decision went against Colenso, and it is significant that he appealed to a civil body, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, rather than to an ecclesiastical one. The question that arose from this was one of the relation between the secular government and the Church of England overseas and was just one area where the state involved itself in religious matters.

The decision taken by Feild upon this subject reflects a basic Tractarian principle of protesting against Parliament's Erastian understanding of the Church of England. That concept implied that religious truth was second to the secular power and the only test of belief was that ordained by political convenience.[132] However, since for Tractarians the episcopal government of the church was from Christ, and not from humans, the church was not subservient to the interests of the state. Although the interests of church and state were considered the same, beginning in 1534 when Henry VIII issued the Act of Supremacy and declared himself head of the Church of England, the Royal Supremacy was finally broken in the early nineteenth century. When Roman Catholics, dissenters, and others, took their place in Parliament, there was no longer any guarantee that the interests of the state would coincide with those of the Church of England. As Tractarians such as Feild saw it, Parliament was "composed in great part of persons not only ignorant of, but hostile to, the Church's power and privileges."[133] He felt that in an age of rationalism and Erastianism, the Church of England needed to distance itself from such a

---

[131] C. Brad Faught, *The Oxford Movement: A Thematic History of the Tractarians and Their Times* (University Park, PA: State University Press, 2003), 143-4.
[132] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 53.
[133] Edward Feild, *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda by the Bishop of Newfoundland at his Visitation, on St. Mark's Day 1853* (Halifax: William Gossip, 1853), 7.

parliament if it was to retain or regain any measure of control. The Oxford Movement, from its very beginnings, protested against Parliamentary interference in ecclesiastical matters and sought to define the Church of England in decidedly supernatural terms. Keble's Assize Sermon began the process, quickly followed by Newman's second *Tract for the Times*, "The Catholic Church," which further protested Erastian actions taken against the church in Ireland.[134]

Those who were advocates of apostolic succession and episcopal government, Feild included, perceived the activities of the English Parliament relating to the Irish bishops and Royal Letters Patent as especially ominous. While the Church of England was not a human institution because it was ruled by bishops, the government controlled apostolic succession because it had charge of the nomination of bishops.[135] In order to maintain secular objectives, the government had no qualms about interfering in the sacred order of the church. Feild did not welcome any such lay interference. He felt that the laity had no place in the consideration or determination of church doctrine and any such intrusion was both "unsuitable and unsafe."[136]

The situation of Feild's diocese of Newfoundland and Bermuda was even more complicated concerning laws affecting the church. Acts of Parliament and ecclesiastical laws were passed in England that related to the Church of England; however, they only affected the church in the two colonies if they were "expressly extended to them, or unless, not being so extended, they are adopted by the Colonial Legislature."[137] This allowed Feild to ignore all legislation that he did not approve of as inapplicable to his

[134] "Tracts for the Times," http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/index.html
[135] Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, vol.1, *Part One: 1829-1859*, 77.
[136] Tucker, *Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of Edward Feild,* 132.
[137] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ...1866*, 22.

diocese. The state of affairs got complicated in 1853 when Feild asked for a legal opinion regarding the laws of Bermuda. He was concerned most especially with canon law, and, specifically, which revision of canon law was applicable to the colony. He found out that it was the Canons of 1603 that were in force since the colonists of Bermuda, "having been settled in the year 1609, brought with them so much of the Laws of their Mother Country as were in force at that time," and none past that time applied.[138]

Feild thought that controversies regarding the secular state making decisions for the Church of England would continue until the bishops of the church regained the power of self-governance, no matter how limited in scope at first. The Church of England's own governing and legislative body was Convocation and, upon Feild's 1853 visit to England, he saw a general desire "expressed for the revival of the Church's actions in Convocation, as the only safe and legitimate means of ... reformation."[139] By meeting in Convocation within the Archdioceses of Canterbury and York, the Church of England would be able to reform and regulate issues of discipline and doctrine. In his Charge of 1858, Feild was encouraged to announce that the Canterbury Convocation had recently met and discussed items of importance to the church. Even more significant to Feild was "the power now granted to each Diocese to meet in Synod," although the particular conditions of Newfoundland presented great difficulties of its accomplishment.[140] He always encouraged his clergy to meet with each other regularly in order to strengthen their faith and discuss problems and concerns. Feild had been part of such a clerical society when he ministered in England and wished his clergy to do likewise. Through

[138] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1853*, 15.
[139] *Ibid*, 7.
[140] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 41. It was not until 1871 that Feild's coadjutor bishop Kelly formed a diocesan synod for Newfoundland.

such regular gatherings, all matters of parochial care would be discussed and unanimity obtained, specifically on "the administration of Divine Service, the visitation of the sick, the management of schools and other local charities."[141]

Methods of Church Finance

The Church of England, in its position as a supernatural institution, separate from secular interests, needed to have the power to legislate for itself and to have final say in actions and motions made for the church's benefit. In Feild's mind, it was impossible for his church to obtain any measure of self-government without also becoming financially self-supporting. As long as church members did not supply money to support the church, outside forces felt they had a say in its direction and activities. In England, the church could count on a somewhat stable financial system since the Church of England was the established church of the country. The country divided itself into parishes; households paid parish rates, and benefited from the sacraments because they were parishioners and it was the parish that paid the clergyman.[142] The connection between paying parish rates and receiving the sacraments and services of the church might not have been clear, but it was there.

Although the Church of England in Newfoundland was not established and, therefore, not divided into parishes, emigrants had "so long been accustomed to the endowments which the Church possesses at home, that they are slow to learn the lesson ..., that if they will have the ministrations of religion they must provide themselves with them."[143] He consistently insisted that Church of England laity must provide for the financial support of their clergy. Feild found the church in Newfoundland especially

[141] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1853*, 25.
[142] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 46.
[143] Tucker, *Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of Edward Feild*, 44.

weak because of its long history of outside support. Local people had made few sacrifices in support of their church, perhaps because of the notion that "the Clergy in Newfoundland were maintained by the Government in England."[144] In this, Feild thought, the people were gravely mistaken, because it was through the resources of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG) that missionaries were sent to Newfoundland and maintained while there. The SPG funding was not reliable because it came from collections the society made in England and the amount of these collections varied. Feild did not want to rely on the collections because the poor of England gave funds to a church that should not have needed them. The SPG provided most of the financial underpinning for the Church of England in Newfoundland, but, throughout Feild's time as bishop, this funding was under constant threat of reduction or complete removal. There was a reduction in the stipends of individual SPG missionaries in order to support additional missionaries and due to the SPG's assumption that the church in Newfoundland was firmly enough established so that it was able to support itself.[145]

Feild believed that those in Newfoundland had the ability to support the church that provided them with the spiritual benefit of the sacraments and worship services.[146] He spoke repeatedly on the subject of church finance. He was insistent that those within his diocese support the church because it was a sacred duty enjoined on the people by God. Those who preached Christ's gospel should be supported by that gospel (1 Cor. 9:14). Feild compared the apostles to the Newfoundland clergy and believed his laity held responsibility for clerical support. The bishop clearly referred to this subject in a sermon

---

[144] Edward Feild, *A Plea for Colonial Dioceses: in Reply to Strictures on the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel* (St. John's: John T. Burton, 1865), 27.
[145] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland ... 1847*, 28.
[146] *Ibid*, 31.

in 1851 when he said, "nothing can appear plainer than this duty of maintaining the ministers of Christ's Gospel, in order that our holy fellowship or society may continue."[147]

In order for the church to prosper equally throughout Newfoundland, Feild felt it necessary to centralize the collection of church funds. With such centralization, no longer would a member of the clergy be penalized for any actions or sermons that brought about local disfavour. The contributions were to a general fund, distributed through the Church Society and under the direction of Feild and his successors.[148] It was the duty of the local clergy to collect these funds, a quintal of fish or its equivalent, from heads of households, which did not help to endear them to the congregations.

All contributions were obligatory, not voluntary, and Feild was quite willing to penalize those who, having the means, refused to pay, by withholding the ordinances of the church. This caused much controversy, although Feild himself pointed out that he never required any clergyman to withhold church offices or ordinances. Rather, it was "that I [Feild] ... consider a Clergyman in this Diocese justified in withholding the ordinances of the Church from any person, the head of a family, who, being able, refuses to make some annual acknowledgment for them."[149] The difference between "require" and consider "justified" was a fine one and was not at all clear, perhaps intentionally. Church Society collections began in earnest in 1846, and the amount raised was not enough to make the church in Newfoundland completely self-supporting. The fortunes of the Church Society were inextricably linked with the condition of the fishery as well as

---

[147] Edward Feild, *The Church of the Holy Apostles. A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of Christ Church, in the Parish of Devonshire, Bermuda: on the Feast of the Annunciation, 1851* (Hamilton, Bermuda: Donald M'Phee, 1851), 11.
[148] For detailed discussion on this topic, see the Bibliography, especially the titles by Calvin Hollett.
[149] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 44.

with the person of the bishop. Feild was the embodiment of the Church of England and any dissatisfaction with Feild translated into a decrease in Church Society funds.[150]

In Newfoundland, the financial situation of the Church of England was always changing and clergy stipends were generally insufficient and never stable. Feild found it difficult to recruit priests from England since he was unable to guarantee a competitive rate and the rewards of a missionary life were not perceptible to many. The situation of the unendowed and struggling church of Newfoundland did not extend to Bermuda. The church there had much assistance and the local government provided buildings and stipends to the clergy. With its division into nine parishes, although not all of them provided with priests, Bermuda resembled England. Each of the priests or rectors received a stipend from the colony's treasury. In addition, there was a sum, assessed on the whole parish and paid through the vestry. Because of this parish assessment, all the inhabitants of a particular parish had the rights of parishioners as far as the services and sacraments of the church were concerned.[151]

The clergy of Bermuda received a reliable and fixed stipend, which partially made up somewhat for its small amount. Although Feild recognized the benefit of such a payment, he reminded his clergy not to be content with this state of affairs. Since the community of Bermuda consisted almost entirely of members of the Church of England, "whatever the colony does for the Church, it does specially and directly for ... the whole community."[152] Therefore, clerical lobbying for an increase of the stipend was not something Feild frowned upon, but, rather, a practice he strongly encouraged. Although

---

[150] Edward Feild, *An Address on the System of the Church Society in Newfoundland Submitted to the Members of the Church of England* (St. John's: J. C. Withers, 1854), 3.
[151] *Ibid*, 7.
[152] Edward Feild, *A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda on the Tuesday in Easter Week, 1849* (St. John's: John W. McCoubrey, 1850), 4.

clergy stipends from government grants were beneficial to the clergy of Bermuda, Feild was not satisfied with them. Neither the church nor the clergy were able to act independently of the government because the stipends were not permanent, liable to reduction or withdrawal after a certain amount of time.[153] Feild felt it better for his church to become financially self-sufficient, so that it would be able to control its own fate and not be liable to any legislative uncertainty or fluctuations in charitable gifts. In Newfoundland, Governor Harvey offered government support, which Feild turned down on principle.[154]

Education and Cooperation

In order for the Church of England to be completely independent, it was necessary, as well as its duty, for it to take responsibility for the education of the children of its members. Children were the future of the church, and Feild saw the need to train them to become good church members, believing as he did about the unique status of the Church of England. Feild's interest in education was evident from the start of his vocation in England and his devotion to the subject gathered strength while he was parochial school inspector for the National Society.[155] Because of his time as inspector, and the publication of the reports of his findings, Feild became widely known within the Church of England. His appointment to Newfoundland was in part due to his experience in education. It was on the strength of his educational work as inspector, and as rector at Kidlington, that the bishop of London asked him to become the bishop of

[153] Feild, *Address on the System of the Church Society*, 13-4.
[154] Frederick Jones, *Edward Feild, Bishop of Newfoundland, 1844-1876* (St. John's: Newfoundland Historical Society, 1976), 11.
[155] See the two reports of 1841 found in the Bibliography.

Newfoundland.[156] Feild impressed the importance of education upon his clergy in his first Charge, emphasizing Christ's "commission and commandment to feed his lambs," which he considered as having been given to the priests of the church, and not to secular teachers.[157] Education and religion were for Feild firmly intertwined and any education separated from religion would be unsuccessful. As the bishop pointed out, Christ put the two together and any attempts of their division were not just going against the human order of things but against God and his commandments.[158]

Instruction of the young was a sacred duty laid upon the clergy of the Church of England and neglected only at one's peril. Feild expected his clergy to be as interested in education as he was and to be just as concerned with the content of that education. He was "persuaded that you [the clergy] would consider no Education sound or suitable, which was not sanctified by religious knowledge and religious discipline."[159] The goal of Christian education was to instil the truths of Christianity into the students and, since the Church of England was the true exponent of Christianity, that meant the teaching of its catechism. In order for Feild to ensure that children within his diocese were receiving a correct understanding of the truths of Christianity as expressed in the doctrines of the Church of England, it was necessary that he should have ultimate authority regarding schooling. Feild was "persuaded that no Bishop of the Church of England ought to rest satisfied till he can place the religious instruction of the children ... of his own flock and

---

[156] Frederick Jones, "Feild, Edward (1801–1876)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9247 (accessed 24 July 2006).

[157] Edward Feild, *Order and Uniformity in the Public Services of the Church, According to the Use of the United Church of England and Ireland: the Substance of a Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland by Edward Feild, D.D., Bishop of Newfoundland, at his First Visitation, on the Feast of St. Matthew, September 21, 1844* (St. John's: John W. McCoubrey, 1844), 25.

[158] *Ibid*, 38.

[159] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland ... 1847*, 39.

communion, under the direction of the Clergy and other members of that Church only."[160]

Since schools in Feild's diocese were not organized in this fashion, he felt it necessary to take any possible action to provide children of his communion with an education that properly reflected Church of England values and ideals. To accomplish this task, Feild did not scruple to involve himself in local politics. The first schools in Newfoundland were run by the various Christian denominations. The government was not responsible for the education of the children in Newfoundland since there was little local government. Government got involved in the schooling of youth as the population of the colony expanded and the schools established by the varied religious societies were no longer adequate for the needs of the people. Governmental involvement in education formally commenced in 1836 when the Assembly formed a select committee to look into the question of the educational system. This resulted in the Education Act of 1836, which gave monetary support for schools from the government, and set up "common" schools in the outports, but was silent on the question of religious observance. [161] Elementary education was to be non-denominational, since religious instruction was to be taught by the clergy outside of school hours.

This state of affairs did not remain satisfactory for long because the question soon arose about what version of the Bible was suitable for schools. Use of the King James Version within schools upset Catholics greatly. Protestant leaders fiercely opposed attempts by the Catholic Church to remove the Bible from use in schools in order to

---

[160] Edward Feild, *Remarks on the Sub-division of the Legislative Grant for the Encouragement of Education in this Colony* (St. John's, n. p., 1852), 3.
[161] Phillip McCann, "The Politics of Denominational Education in the Nineteenth Century in Newfoundland," in *The Vexed Question: Denominational Education in a Secular Age*, ed. William A. McKim (St. John's: Breakwater, 1988), 31-2.

maintain a non-denominational system of elementary education. In 1843, the legislative grant was divided between Roman Catholics and Protestants generally. Each district gained a Catholic and a Protestant board of education. The monetary legislative grant was split based on the numbers of Catholics and Protestants within each district.[162] After 1843, the conflicts regarding primary education were between the varied denominations of Protestantism on how the grant was to be apportioned.

Feild also sabotaged interdenominational secondary education in Newfoundland by providing a school for boys in St. John's, separate from the Protestant Academy; this school was later to become Bishop Feild College. Shortly after the founding of this institution, the bishop also set up a school for girls in St. John's. This school was first known as the "Bishop Feild Ladies' School," and it eventually became Bishop Spencer College.[163] Secondary education in Newfoundland began in 1844 when the Academy Act set up a non-denominational secondary school in St. John's. This Academy was split between Catholics, "General Protestants," and the Church of England in 1850.[164] It was also in 1844 that Feild instituted his school for boys, and made the tripartite division of secondary education an inevitable outcome.

After his arrival in 1844, Feild became one of the most vocal figures on denominational education in Newfoundland. He was not satisfied with the 1843 Roman Catholic and Protestant split of the grant for primary education and, throughout his time as bishop, he fought for a further division of the legislative grant that would give funding to provide specifically for Church of England elementary education. He refused to accept

---

[162] *Ibid*, 36.
[163] Edgar House, *Edward Feild: The Man and His Legacy* (St. John's: Jesperson, 1987), 36, 50-2.
[164] Frederick Jones, "Religion, Education and Politics in Newfoundland, 1836-1875," *Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society* 12, no. 4 (1970): 65-6.

education without religion and fought for, for almost the rest of his life, the Church of England's just share of the grant. Feild renewed his campaign at various points in the 1850s and 1860s, without achieving his goal. Finally, thirty years after his arrival in Newfoundland, the division occurred. The Education Act of 1874 divided the grant for Protestant education between the Church of England and other Protestants based on their denominational strength. Two years later, in 1876, there was an Act of consolidation.[165] Primary education in Newfoundland was now denominational and divided between Catholic, Anglican, and Methodist. Each denomination was free to educate their children in the manner they saw fit, instilling within their pupils their particular religious understanding.

Feild's campaign for the subdivision of the legislative grant for elementary education on the grounds of the necessity of providing for Church of England schools confused a number of people. They wondered what he thought of the schools of the Newfoundland School Society. Those schools received money from the government under the assumption that the society was providing Church of England schools.[166] However, Feild did not consider them such; although he recognized that they had done much good work in the past. He was unable to work with the Newfoundland School Society if he was to remain true to his belief in the Church of England as the only exponent of correct Christian Faith. The society was evangelical in nature and admitted children of all denominations. The teachers were often Wesleyans, which Feild could not accept since it was impossible for someone who had separated from the Church of

[165] Sheldon, "Establishment of the Denominational School System in Newfoundland," 93. See also Lear, "Edward Feild (1801-1876), Ecclesiastic and Educator."
[166] Established in 1823 by a Newfoundland merchant, Samuel Codner and began to operate in Newfoundland in 1824. The name eventually changed from the Newfoundland School Society to, eventually, the Colonial and Continental Church Society. For more, see Sheldon, 14-7, and Lear, 33-7.

England to teach religious truth. He was also not able to cooperate with the society because of its nature and constitution. Feild was unable to assist or sanction the School Society as long as teachers "can be placed and removed without any reference to the Clergyman; while the Bishop, with his Clergy, has only permission to visit the Schools, without authority to teach the lambs of his flock."[167]

Tractarians such as Feild were unable to work cooperatively with other religious denominations or take part in inter-denominational organizations. The Church of England was the exponent of the true Christian faith; the church could not be part of any association that included non-members, most particularly Wesleyans. Feild exhibited such exclusivist understanding of confessionally oriented education in his actions regarding the Newfoundland School Society and by his criticism of charitable organizations such as the British and Foreign Bible Society. Feild received, and refused, an invitation to join the Bible Society when it established a Branch Association in St. John's. He was unable to join the society since it was composed of persons from different denominations and held the belief that differences between Christian denominations were of minor importance compared with their points of agreement. He published the reasons behind his refusal and later attached this document to the published edition of his 1847 Newfoundland Charge.[168] The people of his diocese had, according to Feild, no need of the Bible Society since it was the responsibility of the clergy and the Church of England Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK) to provide copies of the Bible, not some interdenominational organization. In Feild's understanding, the Church of England would only prosper if it stood alone, self-sufficient in all respects.

---

[167] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 69.
[168] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland ... 1847*, 47-54.

Summary

Although the governments of England, Newfoundland, and Bermuda, considered themselves the final authority over the Church of England, as a Tractarian Feild was unable to concur. The Oxford Movement began in response to this Erastianism and Feild showed his Tractarianism by fighting to restore at least a measure of independence to the church. Through the unbroken line of the apostolic succession of its bishops, the Church of England was linked to the time of Christ and in no way a purely human institution. As successors of the apostles, Feild understood the bishops and priests within the Church of England to be the only valid ministers of Christ as well as the only means of the transmission of sacramental grace through the correct administration of the sacraments. The Church of England stood in a middle position, or *via media*, between the Church of Rome and the Reformed Churches of the Continental Reformation. It was both Catholic and Reformed, and, as a Tractarian, Feild sought to restore long ignored Catholic dimensions to the church within his diocese, despite the Evangelicalism that he found in place upon his arrival in St. John's. Since its bishops and not the secular power governed the Church of England, Feild wished the church to become an autonomous body, legislatively, financially, and educationally. For Feild, the legislative situation was complicated due to Newfoundland and Bermuda's position as colonies since laws made regarding the church within England did not necessarily apply to the church in his diocese. Financially, the bishop worked through the Church Society to enable his church to become self-supporting and for his people to take financial responsibility for their religion. Feild understood that it was impossible to separate religion and education, so any education within his diocese must be the responsibility of the Church of England.

Upon his arrival in St. John's in 1844, he formed a secondary school for boys, in order that they receive a proper education - one that ensured they were taught the fundamentals of their faith. Throughout his episcopate, Feild worked on subdividing the legislative grant for education in order to bring about specifically Church of England primary schools. Believing as he did in the Church of England as the only true expression of Christianity, he was also unable to work cooperatively with others in interdenominational organizations.

Chapter 4 The Worship and Liturgy of the Church

Importance of Christian Worship

Feild held that the Church of England was the place where true Christianity existed and where Christians defined themselves as a worshipping community of saints. For the bishop, worship had two purposes; the lesser one consisted of edifying the worshipper, and the principal one in glorifying God.[169] Worship at the time of the Oxford Movement had often become stale and unprofitable, with little reverence or regard paid to the meaning of the various services. It was, in the eyes of Tractarians, too "Protestant," with excessive emphasis placed on preaching and too little attention on the sacraments. The Oxford Movement placed stress on the ancient Catholic expressions within its own tradition, in hopes that those forms would revive a deeper spirituality that was absent from the contemporary church. Reliance on practices and structures did not mean that Tractarian worship was regimented and superficial, rather the opposite.

Unlike dissenters and Evangelical members of the Church of England who stressed preaching and individual conversion, Tractarians emphasised the sacraments and the sacramental liturgy. Their sacramental principle expressed the conviction that the divinely appointed means of growth in devotion and holiness were the sacraments and ordinances of the church.[170] Like other Tractarians, Feild held to this principle, and his writings and activities while bishop showed his repeated attempts to raise the level of spirituality within his diocese through sacramental and liturgical means.

Throughout his episcopate, Feild was concerned with the public and occasional

---

[169] Edward Feild, *God Glorified in His Saints. A Sermon Preached in St. John's Church, Bermuda, on the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 1846* (Hamilton, Bermuda: Donald M'Phee, 1846), 3.
[170] Livingston, *Modern Christian Thought*, vol. 1, *Enlightenment and the Nineteenth Century*, 180.

services of the Church of England. He held with Pusey that proper forms of worship were crucial and that they contained within them a "mystical reverence for God and the Church."[171] A greater emphasis on the sacraments resulted in more stress being placed on church services. This, in turn, led to more attention being paid to the ceremonial attached to the services, as compared to the unadorned services of the dissenters. Feild felt it necessary to turn away from locally-developed service arrangements and emphases and return to worship as set out in the Church of England's *Book of Common Prayer*. He thought that local variations in worship and the administration of the sacraments were not to replace the formularies of the Church of England. The bishop told his clergy to look "to the Church of England herself, - ... her articles and homilies, her creeds and catechisms, her rules and examples of holy life," and by these to "teach and be taught, in these ... to live ... and ... joyfully labour."[172] By his critical attitude toward longstanding ecclesiastical custom within Newfoundland and Bermuda, Feild evoked a strong opposition to his activities. What was important to him was a reliance on the traditions and rubrics of Church of England in order to give God his due praise and glory.

Tradition, Reason, and the Individual

While interpretation of Scripture varies from individual to individual, and such variation inevitably leads to distortion and conflict, the reception of received Christian doctrine as set down by church tradition resulted, according to Feild, in unity and cohesion. Believers in Newfoundland, Labrador, and Bermuda were to depend on the established authorities of Christianity and the Church of England rather than the employment of individual reason or the views of any popular majority. Although an

[171] Faught, *Oxford Movement*, 48.
[172] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland ... 1847*, 46.

unidentified contemporary Church of England authority that Feild considered deserving of respect suggested that clergy should be able to follow the practice of a majority of the people in things non-essential to the faith, Feild did not agree. Relying on the will of a mere majority was something that the bishop disdained since he could not see any reliable method by which a majority could acquire the weight of authority.[173] Any numerical majority would change its opinion when based on popular tastes or when swayed by a particular theory or thinker. Feild did not appreciate concepts favoured by a mere majority of the clergy or laity in his diocese since he had no faith in public opinion.

What was necessary was "to know and teach the doctrine and rule of our Church."[174] Feild joined with the wider Oxford Movement in repudiating accusations of innovation. He constantly pointed out that all of his conceptions and religious activities had their basis within the tradition of the Church of England. The Oxford Movement was a movement of restoration, and authority existed within the traditions and corporate teachings of the church.[175] Reliance on church authority did not mean that individuals were not to read the Bible for themselves. While Scripture included everything that was necessary for Christian salvation, the Bible was not easy to understand. Tractarians also did not consider the Scriptures as the only teacher of religious truth or the sole source of faith. In order to minimize dissention and prevent heresy, helps to understanding the Bible were necessary. Reliance on reason alone was also not encouraged since the individual was of less value than church tradition and its authorities. As understood by

[173] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 29.
[174] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 48.
[175] Livingston, *Modern Christian Thought*, vol. 1, *Enlightenment and the Nineteenth Century*, 171.

Newman and other Tractarians, faith was "told, revealed and enacted" within history.[176]

Feild was in favour of people reading the Scriptures but he counselled caution since, "we are not at liberty to interpret any texts for ourselves contrary to the declared judgment and tradition of the Church."[177] The laity of Newfoundland and Bermuda, after suffering neglect for many decades by the Church of England, did not fully understand the concepts of their church or those of Christianity in general. In many places, Feild's clergy felt that they had first to instil within their people the basics of education before teaching them the truths of the Church of England. This gradual process of imparting the faith was in accordance with the Tractarian doctrine of reserve in communicating Christian knowledge.[178] This doctrine was in opposition to the Wesleyan and Evangelical style of popular religion, which put forward the Bible to the common people without proper guidance or any interpretative framework on the part of the clergy. The doctrine of reserve held that not all members of the Church of England were ready to receive the entirety of the scriptures all at once. The basic concepts of Christianity were first to be propounded and, once those were understood, clergy moved on to more complex teachings.[179]

The concept of reserve in communicating religious knowledge received criticism from those who believed that the Tractarians believed in esotericism and secrecy, but that was not what the Oxford Movement taught. Reserve was related to the inner character of the individual and had a moral function; awe and reverence towards religion were emphasized. Having a reserved attitude towards religion and towards life expressed itself

---

[176] John Henry Lewis Rowlands, *Church, State, and Society: The Attitudes of John Keble, Richard Hurrell Froude, and John Henry Newman, 1827-1845* (Worthing, England: Churchman, 1989), 143.
[177] *Church of the Holy Apostles*, 7.
[178] Clearly expressed in *Tract 80* by Isaac Williams.
[179] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 199-200.

through a respect for tradition, and for the customs of society.[180] The historical truths of Christianity were of greater importance than any wisdom found within contemporary society. The doctrine of reserve showed that it was necessary to spend much time and effort in order to comprehend the truths of the Bible and of Christianity. What Feild found preposterous about Bishop Colenso's religious writings was the fact that Colenso had only spent two years studying the Bible before publishing theories that contradicted received belief on the truth of the Scriptures. Instead of reading Colenso, Feild read and recommended that his clergy consider the opinions of learned authorities on the subject.[181] Better to read those who had taken the time to study the complexities of the Bible than one who propounded theories after only a short period of study.

Private Judgment and the Use of Reason

Nineteenth-century secularism led to a shift where people moved away from a reliance on God and the church to an ever-increasing faith in humanity and its abilities. The church and its institutions were no longer as important as individuals and their private judgment. Human reason appeared to be replacing divine revelation. Feild was aware of this increasing desire of individuals for secular knowledge but remained unimpressed by it. While knowledge might be power, Feild saw the limitations of empiricism and that there existed a danger in increasing human knowledge. He pointed this out in a sermon on board the *Great Eastern* steamer, during its voyage to recover one Atlantic telegraph cable and lay another.[182] This was a dangerous task and its necessity illustrated that human knowledge had not yet surpassed the actions of the natural world.

---

[180] Rowlands, *Church, State, and Society*, 141.
[181] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ...1866*, 27-9.
[182] Edward Feild, *The Dangers of Men's Wisdom and Knowledge: a Sermon, Preached on Board the Great Eastern, in her Passage from Newfoundland to England, after Laying the Atlantic Telegraph Cable of 1866, and Recovering and Completing that of 1865* (London: Metchim and Son, 1866).

The bishop saw that increasing knowledge without being assisted by God's grace was surrounded with danger since it meant that the individual was the center of attention, and God was ignored. It followed, in his eyes, that such a person eventually felt no need for God. Those who depended on their own knowledge and wisdom failed to accomplish the great end of Christianity, their salvation.[183]

There were great dangers in the use of private judgment when reading the Bible, without the corrective of the Church of England's tradition and its formularies and authorities. Feild saw such a depreciation of tradition, and the elevation of the individual, as no less damaging than "the depreciation or disbelief of Holy Scripture," and he warned his clergy to be on their guard.[184] The use of the Bible alone to determine Christian faith and practice, *sola scriptura*, was taught by Wesleyans and Evangelicals and was not at all attractive to Feild. He, and other Tractarians, insisted that human reason and the intellect was of limited use in the discernment of religious truth. There was always the danger that an individual's use of reason and increasing knowledge would result in the conviction that he or she could do without God.[185] Feild saw the secularism of his time entering the Church of England through excessive use of reason and private judgment and repudiated this. He viewed the world through religious and ecclesiastical lenses and wanted his people to have the same spiritual vision of the world and, more specifically, of the Church of England.

Established Authorities: the Early Church and the English Reformers

In the interpretation of Scripture, the Church of England was fortunate that it could turn to established authorities for guidance. Turning to established church

---

[183] *Ibid*, 9, 12.
[184] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1866*, 31.
[185] Feild, *Dangers of Men's Wisdom and Knowledge*, 9.

authorities was considered vital since it was the church that gave instruction and the Bible that confirmed those teachings.[186] The Oxford Movement believed that Scripture could only be understood in the light of the ancient church, through the pronouncements of the early church councils and the collected writings of the church fathers. Feild was in agreement with his fellow Tractarians and believed that "the practice of the Primitive Church [was] the best of commentaries" on the Scriptures.[187] The turn to the early church was justified with the church fathers' greater proximity to the time of Christ, and their teachings, to the Tractarians, accurately represented those of Christ and his apostles. The fathers, councils, and early creeds, all came from an undivided church, and their pronouncements represented the collective thought of Christianity. A number of the *Tracts for the Times* touched on the ancient church, most especially *Tract 34*, entitled "Rites and Customs of the Church," written by Newman, and published on 1 May 1834. It was greatly concerned with tradition and pointed out that the rites and ceremonies of the ancient church, favoured by the Tractarians, came from Christ's warrant, although they were not necessarily explicit in the Bible.[188]

Many of the Tractarians focussed on the early church in their search to restore the Church of England to its roots, bypassing the English Reformation as a source. Normative authorities looked upon were instead the early church, the church fathers, and their creeds and councils. Froude and his immense dislike of the Reformers influenced these Tractarians. He did not care for the English Reformers because he felt that they "lacked a due sense of reverence for things holy; they rejected Catholic doctrine,

[186] Chadwick, ed., intro. to *Mind of the Oxford Movement*, 37.
[187] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 48.
[188] "Tracts for the Times," http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/index.html

disobeyed bishops, and laughed at the Mass."[189] Feild felt the early divines were significant figures and that it was through the efforts of 'the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops' that "sound and enlarged views of divine truth ... [were] collected out of the Scriptures."[190] Although Feild considered the early divines as significant figures, he did not dismiss the English Reformers. He never mentioned any of the church fathers by name, but he did quote a number of the Reformers. Feild did so in two of his Charges to his clergy in Newfoundland, those of 1858 and 1866. In both cases, the discussion was about the doctrine of apostolic succession, where he specifically quoted Bishop Jewel, Bishop Hooper, Archbishop Cranmer, and Archbishop Parker. Feild considered himself to be a "true son of the Reformers" but felt that they were "of more or less weight according to their learning, piety and ability."[191]

Rules, Rubrics and the Book of Common Prayer

Two distinct characteristics of the Church of England are the Thirty-Nine Articles and the *Book of Common Prayer*. Individuals assent to the former to prove their church membership while the latter contains the services for the Church of England. The Prayer Book and its directions for liturgical action, or rubrics, lays out how to conduct the worship services of the church. Without the rubrics, Church of England clergy would have no set standard for the performance of worship. The services in the *Book of Common Prayer* comprise the liturgy of the Church of England, the official public worship of the church. The Church of England's liturgy did not spring up fully formed with the English Reformation, and the liturgy remained a Catholic one, although no

[189] Baker, "Hurrell Froude and the Reformers," 248.
[190] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 7.
[191] *Ibid*, 28-29.

longer in Latin, purged of all latter-day additions and perceived errors. Tractarians attempted to return the worship of the contemporary Church of England to its Catholic liturgical roots. Their interest in the liturgy originated with the private lectures given at the University of Oxford by Dr. Charles Lloyd, which were attended by Feild and many of the future leaders of the Oxford Movement. Lloyd demonstrated the development of the English liturgy from its sources in the early church through the Roman Missals and breviary to the current services of the Church of England.[192]

As the service book of the Church of England, the *Book of Common Prayer* was first developed during the reign of Edward VI. The Litany in English had appeared in 1544, in the last years of the reign of Henry VIII. Archbishop Cranmer was the main author of the first English service book that was published in 1549. The twin importance of prayer and the sacraments to the Church of England is found within its title, *The Booke of the Common Prayer and Administracion of the Sacramentes, and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Churche After the Use of the Churche of England.*[193] This prayer book was intended not to introduce anything new into the Church of England, but contained the ancient services of the church, simplified and purified. Efforts directed at more decisive reforms of the ancient services led to a second, modified, prayer book that came into use in 1552. Further changes to the *Book of Common Prayer* took place when it was reintroduced at the ascension of Elizabeth to the throne. Most important to Tractarians was the insertion of the Ornaments Rubric and changes made in 1604 and 1662.[194] These later revisions produced the form with which the church of Feild and the Tractarians were

[192] Baker, "Hurrell Froude and the Reformers," 247.
[193] *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*, (1910; reprint, with an introduction by E. C. S. Gibson, London: J. M. Dent, 1960).
[194] *Ibid,* xii-xiii.

familiar. Feild was willing to accept that it was possible to alter positively the *Book of Common Prayer*, but he was not desirous of any additional changes. He was content with the Prayer Book as it existed because he was satisfied that the Church of England's "doctrines and rules have been drawn by ... learned men from the records and traditions of the primitive and undivided Church, and confirmed ... by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture."[195] Feild felt that the laity and clergy within his diocese should also be content with the rules of the Church of England as set out by the *Book of Common Prayer* and its rubrics, alongside the Thirty-Nine Articles, and the catechism and creeds of the church.

Although such was controversial in the middle of the nineteenth century, Feild joined especially with followers of the Cambridge Movement in appealing to the Ornaments Rubric when he advocated an increased ceremonial within the churches of his diocese. Feild made sure to encourage "proper 'Ornaments of the Church and of the Ministers thereof,' for which provision is expressly made in the Rubric" found within the *Book of Common Prayer*.[196] The bishop sought the restoration of Church of England services to the manner in which they were arranged by the divines of the church and as laid out in the *Book of Common Prayer*. Charges of innovation in worship laid upon Feild and his fellow Tractarians were repudiated as not being correct since they were actually a return to the letter of the law, to the concrete directions for liturgical services. Feild wished his fellow members of the Church of England in Newfoundland to turn away from local customs and return to the Church of England, to "learn her doctrines, and

[195] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 37.
[196] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 20.

observe her rites and ceremonies, and practise her rules, and obey her laws."[197] It was through strict conformity to the rules and ordinances of the church on the part of Feild's clergy that uniformity in worship was to be achieved.

Feild gave his first Charge to his Newfoundland clergy within a few months of his arrival in 1844, and it was concerned with matters of liturgy and questions of church rubrics. He was unable to discuss matters of local concern at that time since he had only just arrived. The other reason he gave for speaking on *Order and Uniformity in the Public Services of the Church*, as his Charge was titled, was because the time of his arrival in Newfoundland "was marked by much and anxious enquiry on the subject of Rubrical conformity."[198] Feild was concerned with bringing about a stricter adherence to the rubrics of the Church of England because that would bring about uniformity in worship and a higher level of church discipline. The situation within the entire Church of England by the 1830s was one of general laxity in Christian worship. The habit of disregarding the rubrics of the *Book of Common Prayer* had a number of consequences for Church of England clergy. Their sense of conscientiousness was lessened and the way was made clear for even greater deviations in worship. It affected the clergy's influence as teachers and led others to the same disregard for worship forms. Because of their disregard, the laity viewed the clergy negatively, thus gaining an impression, according to William Scott, that "ought not to be made, much less left in people's minds."[199]

Feild never wavered from requiring obedience to Church of England rubrics, despite opposition from members of his clergy and from many of the laity. Since among his people were some whom he regarded as "ill-instructed and ill-disciplined," their

---

[197] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 65.
[198] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland ... 1847*, 5.
[199] William Scott, "Moral Effect of Ritual Irregularity," *Christian Remembrancer* 5, no. 28 (1843): 531.

grievance at "the return to a written rule ... and the appeal to law and authority" was not something to be given in to.[200] Repeatedly through the years, as expressed in his Charges to the clergy of his diocese, Feild emphasized the necessity of a strict conformity to church rubrics. He never let thoughts of popularity, or compromises with local custom, sway him from any action or decision, even where he was willing to pay some attention to his people. Feild was willing to allow his clergy to continue practices sanctified by local custom if the *Book of Common Prayer* contained no rule on the subjects. He was very clear on this and told his clergy that they "must not disobey a plain Rubric" since not even the bishop had the authority to do so.[201]

Various Aspects of Church Liturgy

Through the public services of the church, individuals belonging to the Church of England became a true part of the communion of the saints. It was at this time of communal worship that God received praise, and the spiritual temperature of the community increased. The latter, according to Feild, did only happen, if the members of the congregation paid due regard to the priest and to the sacredness of the services in question. Although regular attendance at public worship was, in Feild's opinion, a duty of much importance, he was aware that not all agreed. This was especially the case in Bermuda, where he could not understand how "some persons, called Christians, around and among us, never attend the services of the Church to join in the public worship of Almighty God."[202] Public worship in England, Newfoundland and Bermuda, had become

---

[200] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland ... 1847*, 9.
[201] *Order and Uniformity*, 21.
[202] Edward Feild, *A Plea for Reverent Behaviour in the House of God. A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of St. David's Chapel, Bermuda, on April 11th 1849* (Hamilton, Bermuda: Donald M'Phee, 1849), 5.

opportunities for socializing, with the latest gossip more important than praising God. Feild was concerned that his clergy impressed upon their people that Church of England church services were foremost "acts of Religion acceptable to God through Christ" and not social events.[203]

His first Charge, *Order and Uniformity*, was a guide to his clergy to assist them in the proper way to conduct church services. Before Feild's arrival, individual priests held services in the manner they considered best, because there was no one enforced standard of public worship. Feild believed that once services followed the blueprint set out by the rubrics of the *Book of Common Prayer*, clergy and lay reverence would improve. Although the outward performance of church services might have seemed a minor matter, Tractarians such as Feild believed that the outward and visible elements of worship were inextricably linked with their inward and spiritual dimension. The visible Church of England was more than just an expedient institution, "it was a sacrament in its common life ... and in the pattern of its worship."[204] Just as revisions to the *Book of Common Prayer* could only happen with much care and thought, if at all, so too was the case with changes to the services of public worship. Two early *Tracts for the Times*, one by Newman, on 9 September 1833, the other by Froude, on 31 October 1833, addressed this very question.[205] They discussed questions of altering the liturgy and shortening the church service, and both authors opposed any such modification of public worship.

Public Worship Services in the Church of England

Sunday was the day set aside for Christian public worship, but that did not mean

---

[203] *Ibid*, 27.
[204] Geoffrey Rowell, *The Vision Glorious: Themes and Personalities of the Catholic Revival in Anglicanism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), 8.
[205] "Tracts for the Times," http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/index.html

that praising God was only appropriate on that day. The *Book of Common Prayer* contained orders for prayers each day throughout the year. Daily services became more and more popular within Tractarian parishes by the middle of the nineteenth century. Feild was also emphatic about worshipping God each day and, just ten days after his arrival in St. John's, gave notice of the commencement of daily prayers at St. Thomas' Church.[206] The clergy of the town saw to it that the service occurred since the bishop's many duties made it impossible for Feild alone to say the prayers each day. He encouraged his priests to introduce a daily service in their churches, no matter the anticipated size of the congregation. Attendance at daily prayers was valuable since the service served to turn the mind away from secular matters and toward the divine. Feild gave great praise to the memory of one of his priests, Jacob George Mountain, 1818-1856, who maintained daily morning and evening prayer in his church throughout the year.[207] With this example, Feild attempted to impress upon his clergy that daily service was not impossible to achieve outside of St. John's. In St. John's, multiple priests took responsibility for the continuity of the prayers, but Mountain was able to accomplish this on his own. Sunday was the day especially appointed for full public worship; prayers were said daily, but full services also took place on other days. Feild felt that if there was to be a second full service during the week, Friday was most appropriate, since it was already marked with significance for Christians, because of Christ's sacrificial death on the cross.[208]

Originally, the worship on Sunday mornings was divided into three distinct

[206] Feild diary, 14 July 1844.
[207] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 6. For more on Mountain, see George Halden Earle, "Mountain, Jacob George," in *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online,* general editor Ramsey Cook, http://www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=38219&query=mountain (accessed 17 April 2007).
[208] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 35.

services- the Litany, Morning Prayer, and the service of communion. In the centuries since the institution of the *Book of Common Prayer*, the separate services had merged into one very lengthy public worship service. Feild's clergy, in common with their English counterparts, omitted or altered various parts of the service in order to have it finish in a timely fashion. In order to bring his clergy to a better knowledge of the historical separation and significance of the services, Feild discussed the distinct parts of worship in detail in his 1844 Charge. He also pointed out any variations he had observed in their services. Feild let his clergy know what was required by the Church of England's rubrics, what was not forbidden, and what he felt was the best practice when there was no particular rule given.[209]

The merging of the different services brought about many questionable results concerning the originally separate service of communion. This was the third service that took place on Sunday mornings, but not every Sunday. Since the celebration of the sacrament was infrequent in Newfoundland and Bermuda, when it did take place, it was added at the end of the regular Sunday morning service. Since it was not usual for the entirety of the congregation to receive the sacrament, the question arose about the appropriate time of the departure of the non-communicants from the church service. No directions were given in the *Book of Common Prayer* because the service was originally a separate one and only those wishing to communicate would attend. The issue was not so important before Feild's arrival in the diocese because the sacrament was rarely offered. The *Book of Common Prayer* required Church of England members to communicate *at least* three times a year, and this resulted in members *only* receiving the sacrament a total

[209] *Order and Uniformity*, 16.

of three times; keeping to the letter, but not the spirit, of the rubric.[210] Feild introduced frequent and regular communion in the diocese, and thus made the issue of the departure of non-communicants something necessary to resolve. He advised his clergy that those not wishing to receive the sacrament should leave the church at the same point in time as when there was no communion.[211] Although Feild was never able to achieve the Tractarian ideal of daily communion within his diocese, Church of England members who wished to receive the sacrament had gained many more opportunities to do so. Communion took place every Sunday, as well as during other church festivals whenever possible. Feild was even more pleased that the major festivals offered the opportunity for celebrating the sacrament of communion at two separate times.[212]

Baptism, Catechizing and Holy Days

At the time of Feild's arrival in Newfoundland, there was no uniform procedure for baptism. Not only did it occur at various points during the church service on Sunday mornings, the baptism of infants did not always take place within the church. The Church of England called the sacrament, public baptism, and baptisms within private homes were not necessarily valid. Since the sacrament of baptism brought the one baptized into the communion of saints, it only made sense that the congregation was present to welcome the child. Feild stressed uniformity of practice respecting this sacrament and could not understand those priests, especially the ones in Bermuda, who went against the clear rubrics of the church. In order to instruct his Bermudan clergy in the correct manner of public baptism, or baptism in the church, he gave them the example of his Cathedral in St. John's. Baptisms in the Cathedral, as instituted by Feild, and in accordance with

[210] Scott, "Moral Effect of Ritual Irregularity," 534.
[211] *Order and Uniformity*, 19.
[212] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 18.

Church of England rubrics, took place "only after the Second Lesson on some Sunday or other Holy day."[213] Baptism at any other time or location was unsuitable. Feild wanted his clergy to conform to his own wishes about this practice so that uniformity would exist and opportunities for conflict could be minimized.

Feild was always concerned with the education of children, as seen in his attempts to gain separate Church of England schools, and this educational interest extended to the official worship services of the church. It was the duty of every priest to educate the children of his congregation to a detailed knowledge of their faith. While this was somewhat satisfied by Sunday schools, Church of England rubrics enjoined, and Feild impressed upon his clergy, the duty of public catechizing.[214] Public examination was very important because knowledge of the catechism was necessary for all persons wishing confirmation and full Church of England membership. Feild recognized that regular and systematic catechizing created much labour for his clergy, but that did not dissuade him from advising that it take place. Even if it occurred only once a month, Feild felt that regular public catechism resulted in "a deeper appreciation ... of Divine Truth."[215] This appreciation was engendered within the children being catechized and the congregational audience.

Although the Church of England celebrated many festivals throughout the year, the manner of their celebration within Newfoundland and Bermuda was not completely to Feild's liking. There were grave consequences arising from the neglect of keeping holy days, and from omissions of their proper celebration. Many congregations celebrated the

---

[213] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1866*, 37.
[214] Catechisms are manuals that contain the doctrines of a particular church, often in a question-answer format that is to be memorized.
[215] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 65.

festivals of the church, but that was only half the obligation. No one was entitled to keep the holy days as festivals "without any corresponding seasons of fast and humiliation and repentance."[216] The holy day itself was a time of rejoicing, and the night before, a time of fasting and penitence. Feild did not leave it up to his priests to determine the times of fasting and feasting, since the *Book of Common Prayer* provided tables of both. Not all holy days occurred on Sundays, and it was the duty of the priest to inform the congregation of any that occurred during the week.

Church Music: Psalms and Hymns

In addition to returning the varying services of the church in Newfoundland and Bermuda to the practices laid out within the *Book of Common Prayer*, Feild was interested in involving the congregation in the church services. He believed that church music was very important and that it was not enough for a small choir to sing praises to God; the entire congregation needed to get involved. Throughout his career, in England and in Newfoundland and Bermuda, Feild paid much attention to the use of psalms and to the general musical aspect of the divine service. He was so certain of the significance of psalmody that, in 1831, he published a handbook for children on the subject.[217] Feild's interest in psalmody and in the use of hymns was typical for the Oxford Movement. The leaders of the movement might not have made any official pronouncements on church music, but that did not mean that they were disinterested in the topic. As well as publishing translations of Greek and Latin hymns, many Tractarians, including Keble and Newman, wrote some of their own.[218] Feild was not interested in writing his own hymns

---

[216] *Order and Uniformity*, 18.
[217] Edward Feild, *Help to the Knowledge and Practice of Psalmody for the Use of Schools: Part 1* (Oxford: W. Baxter, 1831).
[218] Moorman, *History of the Church in England*, 363.

and, in fact, he was only in favour of employing hymns tested by time. He disliked any innovation and let his clergy know that the only hymns and psalms allowed within church services were those found within the *Book of Common Prayer* and its hymnal. By following this practice, Feild hoped that his clergy would "avoid the bold and irregular flights and indecent familiarities, not to mention graver errors of speech and doctrine," found within too many modern metrical versions of psalms and hymns.[219] He considered it best to go against local musical customs and return to hymns and psalms hallowed by their inclusion in the prayer book, which were in existence from the beginning of the church.

Feild was certain that each part of the public services of the church was important and felt that his clergy needed to ensure that they gave due reverence and attention to all of them. This even included the manner in which the priest chanted, rhythmically spoke or sang, various parts of the church service. Chanting was a practice employed ever since the beginning of Christianity and chants had always been the songs of the church. Although chanting the service had its opponents, for Feild, chanting was not something superficial or done for effect. Rather it was the opposite, since the "very object of chanting is to render our recitation of every part of the Divine Service not only dignified and beautiful, but natural and simple."[220] He understood that worship needed to be adorned, as long as its ceremonial was appropriate for the glorification of God. Since the public worship service was a declaration of an inward reverence for God, outward expressions of this veneration were necessary. As Tractarianism spread outside Oxford, "mystery and movement, colour and ceremonial," became part of church decoration and

[219] *Order and Uniformity*, 13.
[220] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 32.

church services.[221] Throughout his time as bishop, Feild brought about many modifications in the conduct of the worship of the Church of England as it was practiced in Newfoundland and Bermuda. These changes were neither done on a whim and nor were they carried out in isolation. Changes in worship joined alterations in the appearance of churches; as the one was uplifted, so too was the other.[222]

Sermons and Preaching

Worship in Newfoundland before Feild's arrival was evangelical in tone and the sermon was the centerpiece of public church services. This worship was too "Protestant" for Feild because so little stress was on the sacraments and so much emphasis on preaching. Preaching was lifted above praying to God and, most markedly, above the celebration of communion. Feild recognized the high status of the sermon upon his arrival in Newfoundland and, in his 1844 Charge, he questioned "whether such preference be wise and righteous, - for the honour of our Redeemer, or the edification of His Church."[223] Clearly, Feild was not in favour of this exaltation and, in this Charge, attempted to illustrate to his clergy the importance all aspects of the various public services of the church. He had no wish to remove preaching from church services, but, rather, have his clergy return preaching to what he considered its proper place. All Tractarians agreed that the sermon was a necessary part of worship, but when the sermon became too distinct and prominent within worship, then it was time for a change. Preaching had even encroached upon the Eucharistic service, which was something that the Tractarians, as sacramentalists, could never accept.[224] Although contrary to the

[221] Rowell, *The Vision Glorious*, 116.
[222] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 17.
[223] *Order and Uniformity*, 10.
[224] Scott, "Moral Effect of Ritual Irregularity," 536.

arrangement of church services found within the *Book of Common Prayer*, the contemporary Sunday morning service combined the formerly separate services of Litany, Morning Prayer, and the Eucharist. Because of this, on those days when the Eucharist was distributed, and this took place much less frequently than the Tractarian Feild wished, the service was very long. In order to alleviate this problem, Feild suggested that the clergy shorten their sermons. He pointed out that, although sermons were included within the *Book of Common Prayer*, the canons or rubrics did not specify any particular form or length.[225]

Feild's concern for order and uniformity even included the form and content of pulpit discourses. He did not believe the clergy should expound upon Christian theology or preach only a particular doctrine when in the pulpit. Feild felt that congregations within his diocese were not able to understand such things. Instead, he advised his clergy that the times and the condition of their congregations necessitated "plain and practical" sermons.[226] This practicality not only encompassed the subject matter but also language and method of delivery. Feild wanted the public church services in his diocese to bring about an increased reverence for worship and thus disapproved of any types of preaching that did not work towards this goal. He especially disapproved of anything that resembled "sensation preaching." Such sermons were preached to bring about instantaneous conversion in the hearts of those who heard them. The emotions were played upon, and the intellect was ignored. That type of preaching was popular in the United States from the end of the eighteenth through to the middle of the nineteenth century, as waves of revival passed through the land. It was Wesleyan or Evangelical in nature and did not

---

[225] *Order and Uniformity*, 22.
[226] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 66.

tend to inspire reverence and awe, but rather fear and trembling. The bishop warned the Bermuda clergy against the practice in 1866 when he reminded them of their duty and privilege to preach Christ's gospel unto the poor.[227]

Summary

Feild arrived in his new diocese to find that worship within the Church of England was evangelical in tone, something he was unable to accept. Preaching was magnified to the detriment of the sacraments, and private judgment was thought of as more important than reliance on established authorities within the church. Even more unfortunate for him was the preference of local custom over the rules and laws of the Church of England. Feild was a Tractarian in that he worked to elevate Christian worship and attempted to give a sacramental orientation to the life and devotions of his Church of England flock. He paid no regard for popularity in order to achieve these important goals. Feild saw himself not as an innovator, despite claims of being so by his opponents, but rather laboured to return the Church of England in Newfoundland and Bermuda to its roots in the *Book of Common Prayer*. He worked to turn his diocese away from its excessively "Protestant" past to a more Catholic ethos and practice in the worship and liturgy of the church. Feild's efforts were typically Tractarian in that they were an expression of restorationism, which linked the present with the early Christian church, and sought to restore its beliefs and practices.

[227] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1866*, 39.

Chapter 5 Sacramental Life in the Church of England

Importance of Sacraments

Before Feild's arrival, the sermon was the paramount act of worship within the Church of England in Newfoundland. Feild did not share this notion, since, to him, the sacraments and their proper administration were what was of overarching importance to the church.[228] The pulpit needed to be diminished and the altar upraised. Since nothing was more significant than the Christian sacraments, they were not to be administered without due regard taken by clergy and laity. The laypeople were to approach the sacraments in an attitude of faith and repentance. A sacrament was an outward and visible sign of the grace of God, and the means by which the believer received that gift of grace. Although the sacraments were signs, this did not mean that they were merely figures of absent things. They were "effectual" signs of grace, although in a manner difficult, if not impossible, to define.[229]

Being both sign and means, the sacraments of the church had immense value for Feild. He considered it imperative that the clergy of his diocese administer them in a worthy manner, as well as giving the laity instruction on their significance. Salvation was not possible without the sacraments, no matter the eloquence of the preacher or the private faith of the individual. In his emphasis on the vital importance of the sacraments to Church of England clergy and laity, Feild joined his fellow Tractarians. Since it was through the sacraments that the believer attained the presence of Christ, their careful administration and reception was necessary. All of the sacraments were important, most

[228] Most Protestants only consider baptism and the Eucharist as sacraments, while Roman Catholics among others, including Tractarians, add to those two, confirmation, confession, matrimony, ordination, and anointing the sick.
[229] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 42-3.

especially, baptism and the Eucharist, "those two great Sacraments which our Church has declared 'generally necessary to Salvation.'"[230] It was through baptism that one joined the Christian communion and received one's spiritual birth. The Eucharist followed this birth, since it was by this sacrament that the Christian's soul received spiritual food. Through the Eucharist, the soul persistently renewed and maintained itself.[231] While ordination is briefly mentioned in his Newfoundland Charge of 1866, the ministry to the sick hardly surfaces in Feild's deliberations.[232] The focus of this chapter will thus be confined to the following sacraments: baptism, confirmation, communion, confession, and marriage.

Baptism, the Spiritual Birth

Through the sacrament of baptism, the soul experienced a spiritual birth. In Feild's understanding, it was through this sacrament that "we enter Christ's Church, [and, in the words of the Catechism,] 'are made ... members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven.'"[233] Baptism imparted righteousness and, through baptism, the individual received spiritual renewal, with the sins of the past being washed away. As well, it was through this sacrament that the individual became part of a community, the communion of saints. Feild greatly honoured baptism and felt that it should not be taken for granted by the laity or administered perfunctorily by his clergy. This was especially the case because the sacrament of baptism, as that of the Eucharist, had explicit scriptural authority. After his resurrection, Jesus sent his disciples out into the world to preach the gospel and to baptize (Matt. 28:19). Those baptized received

---

[230] *Order and Uniformity*, 24.
[231] Livingston, *Modern Christian Thought*, vol. 1, *Enlightenment and the Nineteenth Century*, 179.
[232] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 46.
[233] *Order and Uniformity*, 11.

salvation and, as Feild indicated, baptism joined with faith as both the means and way of salvation.[234]

Because Feild saw baptism as necessary for salvation, he could not understand anyone who slighted or neglected the sacrament. Although baptism into the Church of England was beneficial, this was only so if people realized the significance of the sacrament. Baptism was a sacrament, not something performed because it was the fashionable thing to do. The undue haste with which parents wanted their children to be baptized, illustrated, in Feild's mind, that the clergy within his diocese had not taught both the requirements and privileges of the sacrament. Feild was adamant in insisting that his clergy take care to make both aspects of baptism "better understood, and more seriously and solemnly appreciated."[235]

Practice

Within Feild's diocese, order and uniformity of practice was always a concern. One place where this concern showed itself was in his discussions about the correct administration of all the sacraments. Since it was with baptism that the one baptized became a member of Christ's church, it was only logical that the administration of the sacrament occur in public. Coupled with this was that the church represented the correct place of public baptism, and that it take place at a time when the congregation was present to welcome the baptized individual into the communion of the saints. As far as appropriate times were concerned, Feild reminded his clergy that the Church of England made clear, through the first rubric "or direction in the Ministration of Public Baptism ..., 'that it is most convenient that Baptism should not be administered but upon Sundays,

[234] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 14.
[235] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 59.

and other Holy-Days.'"[236] Baptism at those times, during the regular service, had the advantage of including the greatest number of people to receive the newly baptized. The congregation also served as witnesses to the promises made on behalf of the newly baptized by parents and godparents.

Since baptism was a sacrament that infused grace in the recipient, all the clergy of Feild's diocese needed to administer the baptismal rite correctly. Feild turned to the rubrics of the Church of England when he informed his clergy that baptism required a font of stone, which was missing from the majority of churches within his diocese. Moreover, in order to comply fully with the rubric, the font needed to be large enough for immersion of an infant. This was so because the rubric "distinctly recognizes and approves the practice of dipping, and directs it to be so done," but when the child could not endure it, pouring water upon the child would suffice.[237] However, the method of baptism that employed sprinkling water on the infant, or one of older years, was an improper way of administering the sacrament. Feild insisted that his clergy return to the practices enjoined by the Church of England rubrics, and not retain the extant practice. Throughout England, clergy administered baptism without regard for the Church of England rubrics. William Scott pointed out that this discounting of the rubrics diminished the importance of the sacrament in the eyes of the laity.[238] Through a considered appreciation of the procedures of the administration of baptism, the sacrament regained its proper elevated status within the minds of clergy and laity.

Newfoundland's geography, and the widely scattered nature of its population, made it difficult for all parents to bring their infants to a church for baptism. A lack of

---

[236] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland ... 1847*, 19.
[237] *Order and Uniformity*, 11.
[238] Scott, "Moral Effect of Ritual Irregularity," 533.

clergy exacerbated this, which was also a problem, though to a lesser extent, in Bermuda. In such situations, private baptisms took place. Sometimes, fathers baptized their children, those who could read baptized the children of others, and individuals not of the Church of England baptized those who were members of the Church of England. Feild encountered many instances of private baptism during his voyages of visitation around Newfoundland and to the coast of Labrador. He sometimes came across children baptized with the full Church of England service, only appropriate when performed by a priest, "by a clerk, or captain of a vessel, in a private house."[239] Although private baptism sufficed when there was no other choice, it did not comply with the rubrics, and all those baptized by the laying on of hands needed a formal admission into the Church of England by a priest. Feild was careful to specify the manner in which the reception should take place. He felt the most vital aspect was the examination of whether or not the individual, infant or adult, had a lawful baptism. Such a determination followed certification of the correct use of the water and the proper pronouncement of the words. Certification required eyewitness testimony and could not rely upon any third person, no matter how respectable.[240] The requirement for eyewitness testimony gave further strength to the necessity of godparents for private baptism. With public baptism, there were a greater number of witnesses since the entire congregation was present to welcome the child into the church family. Private baptism was not limited to Newfoundland but took place throughout Canada at this time. However, Canadian Tractarians refused to accept that limitations found within a new country excused irregularities in the administration of

[239] Edward Feild, *A Journal of a Voyage of Visitation in the "Hawk" Church Ship on the Coast of Labrador, and Round the Whole Island of Newfoundland, in the year 1849*, Church in the Colonies, no. 25 (London: The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1850), 66.
[240] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 61.

such an important sacrament.[241]

The requirement of godparents was not an arbitrary one on Feild's part, but their inclusion in the church rubrics indicated their necessity as seen by the entirety of the Church of England. Godparents both witnessed the promises made by the parents to their child, and made promises of their own. In the event of the death or inability of the parents, it was the duty of the godparents to "care for the Christian education of their children ... and tell or teach them such things as a Christian ought to know and believe to his soul's health."[242] Godparents were not to replace parents, but if ever the parents were unable to do so, to ensure that the baptized child gained knowledge of the Christian faith. Through godparents, families were no longer separate entities, and a new family formed through spiritual affinity. While Feild was bishop, there arose two proposed changes to the canon regarding godparents, which he was bound to reject. He was not alone in his objections to the proposals, and a number of those within both Convocations of the Church of England opposed the changes, although not a majority of either. In the past, an acceptable godparent was only one who had received communion. It was logical that this was so since a godparent needed to be capable to see his or her godchild instructed in the Christian faith. The proposed change to "persons capable of receiving the Holy Communion" decreased difficulties in finding the required number of qualified sponsors.[243] The other proposed change had the same purpose as the first. Although its logic was not immediately apparent, it was proposed to make it legal for parents to serve

[241] Christopher F. Headon, "Developments in Canadian Anglican Worship in Eastern and Central Canada, 1840-1868," *Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society* 17 (June 1975): 31.
[242] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1866*, 24-5.
[243] *Ibid*, 23.

as godparents.[244] Feild understood the substitution of the natural parents for the godparents sacrificed the benefits of having godparents at all. Since godparents were to serve as security for the child's Christian upbringing in the place of the parents, this proposed change made absolutely no sense to Feild.

Doctrinal Controversies

With the administration of baptism, the soul of the one baptized achieved a new spiritual birth. This doctrine of the salvific nature of the sacrament was termed baptismal regeneration, since baptism brought about spiritual regeneration. The sacrament was of the utmost importance because the rebirth that it brought about washed away original sin. Tractarians drew support for baptismal regeneration from the *Book of Common Prayer*, and were opposed to Church of England Evangelicals who felt that spiritual regeneration came through conversion.[245] The Evangelical stress on the individual (conversion), was countered by placing emphasis on the priest, and, more specifically, on the sacrament itself. To promote order and uniformity within his diocese, Feild's clergy enforced Tractarian practices, including the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Evangelical members of the Church of England in Newfoundland were not happy with this and one such, Thomas Collett of Harbour Buffett, went so far as to publish his opposition to Feild's policies. Collett felt that Feild's letter on baptismal regeneration was not successful in its attempt to use the Bible and the doctrines of the Church of England to establish that particular understanding of the sacrament of baptism.[246] Although Collett

---

[244] *Ibid.*

[245] Faught, *Oxford Movement*, 66.

[246] Thomas Edwards Collett, *The Church of England in Newfoundland, No. 2: Containing a Statement and Reply of Thomas E. Collett, Esq., J.P., a Brief Review of Proceedings Connected with the Clergy and Church in this Diocese during the Past Few Years, and Observations and Additional Evidence in Confirmation of the Former Statements, and in Refutation of the Attacks upon Them* (St. John's: Joseph Woods, 1854), 13. For more information on Collett and Feild, see Calvin Hollett, "Evangelicals versus

never explicitly gave his own view on baptism, by reading his response, it is obvious that he did not believe in baptismal regeneration, or that baptism was necessary for salvation. In his discussion of Feild and baptismal regeneration, Collett did not explicitly disapprove of the doctrine but felt that those who held it were deserving of the condemnation of the people of Newfoundland.[247] Feild's attempt to link the Bible with baptismal regeneration was shared by other Tractarians, as can be seen from Pusey's *Tract 67*, published in 1835, where he defends the essential nature of baptismal regeneration through "Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism."[248] The battle between Tractarian and Evangelical understandings of baptism and spiritual regeneration was something that continued for years, and had the church, the newspapers, and courts as their arena.

This conflict was not confined to England. From the days of his early episcopate, Feild's name became linked with the supporters of baptismal regeneration. According to Feild, an English religious newspaper publicly made the connection in 1847 and "brought before the public" his views.[249] The year 1847 was significant in the history of the baptismal regeneration controversy since it was in that year that the Gorham court case had its origin. It was precipitated by the refusal of Bishop Phillpott to accept George Gorham, who was an Evangelical, as a priest within his diocese. Phillpott refused because he felt Gorham denied the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Gorham would not accept this refusal, took the case to court, and the case concluded in 1850 when a civil court ruled in his favour and found that baptismal regeneration was not an essential

---

Tractarians. Resistance to Bishop Feild at Harbour Buffett, Placentia Bay, 1849-1854," *Newfoundland Studies* 18, no. 2 (2002): 245-278.

[247] Collett, *Church of England in Newfoundland*, 13.

[248] "Tracts for the Times," http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/index.html

[249] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland ... 1847*, 40.

requirement of faith in the Church of England.[250] What was most horrifying to Tractarians was the fact that the state decided a point of religious doctrine, not the church. The Church of England was denied the power to rule over matters of religious concern.

Feild expressed his own understanding of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration to his clergy in 1847, and again, in 1866. Much of the latter discussion was identical with the former, since Feild was repeating the remarks he had made nineteen years earlier. With regard to baptism as with most aspects of the faith, Feild turned to the historic doctrines of the Church of England for support for his religious thought and actions. He felt that his conception of baptism was that found within the *Book of Common Prayer* since he gave his "unfeigned assent and consent" to "the language and doctrine of the Prayer Book" as required by the Act of Uniformity.[251] Feild felt he was justified in using the term regeneration in connection with baptism because that was the term employed by the *Book of Common Prayer*. Baptismal regeneration was the most appropriate way of describing the doctrine because the *Book of Common Prayer* frequently called the baptized child regenerated and the Articles "made 'Baptized' and 'Regenerate' convertible terms."[252] For Feild, the meaning of words was not static and changed over time. What the English Reformers and the Early Church meant by regeneration was not what those in the nineteenth century understood by the term. However, the latter read the *Book of Common Prayer* through the lens of their time and assigned meanings to baptismal regeneration that were not appropriate to the intentions of the writers. As time went on, the word regeneration began to be employed in ways other than those used by

---

[250] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 94.
[251] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland ... 1847*, 41.
[252] *Ibid*, 42.

the English Reformers and the early church. Therefore, it followed that the conflict was not over the doctrine itself, but "if there be any dispute, or difference, it can only be about the meaning or application of the term or name," and not a theological dispute at all.[253] The most important thing, according to Feild, was to accept the teachings of the Church of England and its understanding of baptism as contained within the Articles and church catechism. The church had historically taught that a new birth took place at baptism and used regeneration to describe this process. Feild felt that it was necessary to use that particular expression to describe the doctrine since that was how the Church of England had always done it.

Confirmation

Through baptism, an individual entered into the communion of saints, but not into full membership within the Church of England. It was only through confirmation that this was achieved. At confirmation, the individual received the Holy Spirit through the laying on of hands, not by the priest, but by the bishop. The chief object of Feild's visits to the many churches in Newfoundland and Bermuda, was "to confirm with gifts of the Holy Ghost, those persons, young or old, whose hearts and understandings, have been prepared to expect and receive them."[254] Just as those baptized who were of older years, people were obligated to come to the confirmation service with faith and repentance, willing to accept the serious nature of their actions. Once someone received the Holy Spirit from the bishop by being confirmed into the faith of the Church of England, he or she gained all the privileges and responsibilities of that membership. Feild was intent on reminding his clergy about this since he disliked how many of the laity looked at confirmation as the

[253] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 39.
[254] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 49.

final act of their religious life. The reality was quite the opposite since, once brought into full communion within the Church of England at confirmation, it was the responsibility of the individual to regularly attend, and partake of, the Eucharist.[255]

Confirmation services only took place when Feild was able to visit the churches within his diocese. The services did not occur as often as he would have liked, due to the geographical isolation of the population in Newfoundland, and, in Bermuda, because he visited the island only every few years. In the case of Bermuda, Feild wished to have services of confirmation at every visit, and impressed upon his clergy the importance of a more frequent administration of the sacrament. Confirmations in Newfoundland could not be on such a schedule, because of the difficulty of travelling from place to place. In order for confirmations to occur, those wishing to receive it by the laying on of the bishop's hands needed preparation. Before Feild would administer the sacrament, he required that the persons wishing confirmation had knowledge of the basic tenets of Christianity, and could answer questions about the dogmas of the Church of England. Feild's concern with the vital significance of confirmation within the life of the church produced fruit late in his life, when he published a *Catechism* on the subject.[256] He was much in favour of continual preparation for confirmation. Due to the irregular nature of the fishery, which employed the majority of the Church of England laity, as well as their widely scattered habitations, a seasonal preparation for confirmation was ill suited for Newfoundland. Feild pointed out to his clergy in both Newfoundland and Bermuda that continual preparation allowed the truths of Christianity and the Church of England to be instilled into the laity, and made them ready for confirmation whenever he was able to

[255] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1853*, 18.
[256] Edward Feild, *A Short Catechism on Confirmation, or Laying on of Hands*, S.P.C.K. Tract 1669 (London: Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1870).

visit. Confirmation resulted in full membership within the church, and those confirmed were expected to partake of communion. Because of this, Feild wished to confirm only those who had reached the age of discretion and who were able to understand the significance of their actions. It was not expedient to confirm those who did not express some desire to profit by the means of grace found within confirmation.[257]

Communion, Spiritual Food for the Soul

The sacrament of baptism provided the soul with its spiritual birth, and the sacrament of communion provided spiritual food for the soul. Both were essential for salvation so that partaking of the Eucharist was not optional but necessary for the continued spiritual health of the individual. Receiving the sacrament meant receiving the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and, therefore, those taking part in communion were engaged in a most holy activity. Because of its august nature, Feild and Tractarians employed commensurate sacramental language. Feild was concerned that his clergy and the laity recognize the overarching significance of the Eucharist. He was pleased to observe devout behaviour among most of the communicants within his diocese.[258] Those who partook of the sacrament had their faith strengthened and gained refreshment for their soul. Receiving the Eucharist was a continual process, and, just as the body needed a continual intake of physical food, so, too, did the soul need repeated infusions of spiritual food. Although receiving the sacrament of communion three times a year had become customary within the Church of England, this was not enough. Tractarians such as Keble who centered their theology on the sacraments, and most especially upon the Eucharist, required communion more than was usual. Keble, Pusey, and Feild's theology

[257] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 10.
[258] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 15.

necessitated both an increase in the number of times communion was offered as well as an increased frequency in its reception.[259] Frequent communion increased devotion to the sacrament, and Feild made sure that his clergy felt the need for additional communion services within their churches. Throughout his time as bishop, Feild sought weekly communion within all the churches of his diocese, in order that the members of the Church of England could receive spiritual food regularly. Although weekly communion did not exist in every church by 1870, when he preached on the subject in Bermuda, he made sure to remind his listeners that they were to "be thankful for the increased opportunities" they had of partaking of the sacrament.[260] Members of the Church of England were to take communion as often as the service took place, but only if they had prepared themselves and approached the sacrament with faith and reverence.

Practice

The Eucharist required reverence and respect from both laity and clergy. The laity was to approach with faith and repentance. Feild also required that his clergy administer the sacrament with reverence. All aspects of the communion service were objects of reverence, including the vessels, cup and paten, involved in the distribution of the sacrament. Feild made it very clear to his clergy that the communion vessels were to be made of silver. Since they were used in the communion service to assist in delivering God's grace through the body and blood of Christ, the cup and paten needed to be of silver, the purest of metals. It was the responsibility of the individual priest to ensure this, and Feild suggested special collections take place to acquire a silver communion set, if no

[259] Rowell, *Vision Glorious*, 35-6, 87.
[260] Edward Feild, *The Means and Methods of a Christian's Life, as Told and Taught by the Form and Arrangements of a Christian Church: a Sermon preached in Trinity Church, Hamilton, Bermuda, on St. Mark's Day, 1870* (London: W. Clinkskel, 1870), 24.

one in a congregation presented the cup and paten as a gift.[261] He did not think that it would be difficult to raise the necessary funds, since the purpose was meant for the spiritual benefit of all.

In order to ensure that the sacrament of the Eucharist received its due reverence throughout his diocese, Feild attempted uniformity in practice of all aspects of the communion service. No facet of the service was too minute for Feild's concern, because all parts were necessary for the sacrament's proper administration. The altar needed to be the focal point within the church since it was beneficial for the congregation to witness the consecration of the elements of bread and wine. In this way, the priests were in sight of the entire congregation during communion, as required by Church of England rubrics. Feild was very emphatic on this point and did not allow any diversity of practice. He felt the rubrics were "plain and express" and the actions taken by the priest in consecration were sacred in significance.[262] Feild was never arbitrary in his preferences, but desired full conformity among his clergy so that the sacrament would receive its due.

The bishop felt very strongly about what he considered the correct mode of administering the Eucharist and had no hesitation in pointing out potential errors or dangers in its administration. He did so even if the error in question was not yet present within his diocese, in order to anticipate possible future problems. This can be seen in his first Charge of 1844 during his discussion of the distribution of the elements to the communicants. The words of the delivery were to be said to one communicant at a time and never to two or more persons at once. Feild pointed out that clergy varied the wording of the delivery from "for thee" when speaking to one person to "for you" when

---

[261] *Order and Uniformity*, 14.
[262] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 27.

the delivery was said to multiple people.[263] Since the wording was clear in the rubrics of the Church of England, Feild felt that they allowed no diversity of practice, and he would not sanction divergent use under any circumstance. Changing the manner of the delivery because the priest felt that the number of communicants was too large signalled that the priest in question did not give the sacrament the reverence Feild considered its due.

In the nineteenth century, communion no longer had its own service but was part of the general Sunday morning worship service. Many people who were not eligible, or who had not made the proper preparation for the reception of the Eucharist attended the worship service. It was necessary that those individuals removed themselves from the church before the commencement of communion. Until Feild's clergy made the confirmed members of their congregation aware of their duty to receive the spiritual food of communion, such departures would have to continue. As he pointed out, the service of communion was a "sacred and strictly enjoined service" of the Church of England and one within which grace was given and received.[264] Feild disliked observing the undignified parade of non-communicants out of the church during the service. He preferred that those who were not going to take communion would not remain for that part of the service. Feild went so far as to agree that individuals who had not made the necessary preparation for the reception of the Eucharist should be forbidden to remain as observers.[265] He understood that the Church of England did not expect that non-communicants should stay for the Eucharistic service, and wished to follow the historical teachings of his church.

---

[263] *Order and Uniformity*, 20-1. Changed from "The Body [Blood] of Christ, which was given for THEE" to "... given for YOU."
[264] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 54.
[265] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 37.

Individuals intending to receive the Eucharist were only to do so after adequate preparation and in a spirit of faith and repentance. Those who had sinned were only to partake of the sacrament after they had repented. This repentance was publicly shown through the altered life of the former sinner- the adulterer had given up adultery, the blasphemer no longer swore. Tractarians such as Feild who believed in following the rubrics of the *Book of Common Prayer*, were required to ensure that they did not administer the sacrament of communion to "open and notorious" evil livers.[266] Feild believed that it was the responsibility of the priest to ensure that no one communicated unworthily. In order to discharge their duty to the church, the bishop advised his clergy to "withhold the Sacrament from persons whose sins and offences, known and unrepented of, render them unfit and unworthy."[267] Although there was a danger of letting personal prejudices enter into the denial of the sacrament, Feild admonished his clergy to be completely objective in their actions. Their duty to the remaining members of their congregation, and the reverence owed the Eucharist, made this extreme recourse to exclusion necessary.

Doctrinal Controversies

Just as, for Feild, the debate within the Church of England over the doctrine of baptismal regeneration was "etymological rather [than] theological," so, too, was the controversy that arose over the sacrament of communion.[268] The Church of England held the doctrine of the real presence, and problems arose through differing definitions given to the term "real." The question was of the manner of the presence of Christ within the

---

[266] John Shelton Reed, *Glorious Battle: The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996), 32.
[267] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 55.
[268] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland ... 1847*, 44.

Eucharist, the sacrament of his body and blood, and this differed depending on how one understood the term "real." Controversies arose in Protestantism, beginning with Martin Luther and Huldrych Zwingli's differing symbolic and realistic understandings of how the presence of Christ entered the communion elements through the words of institution.[269] In Feild's view, once the spiritual was included alongside the carnal and visible as acceptable definitions of "real," those who defended the doctrine of the real presence of Christ within the Eucharist were able to do so without offence.[270] As long as faith followed the Church of England's *Book of Common Prayer*, the words used to describe that belief were of lesser significance.

Some Protestants, such as Baptists and followers of Zwingli, thought of the sacrament as a memorial and that the presence was a symbolic one, while Roman Catholics understood Christ's body and blood to be realistically present in the elements of bread and wine through a substantial change achieved by transubstantiation. Feild saw that the Church of England position as between those two extremes, since there was "a real, though invisible and supernatural, presence of Christ, and that His body and blood are really, though after a heavenly and spiritual manner," taken and received in the sacrament.[271] Feild never provided a precise definition of what he understood by "real presence." What concerned him was the affirmation that Christ did exist within the Eucharist, no matter in what manner. The importance of Christ's presence exalted the sacrament of communion, and that was more significant than trying to unravel just how this occurred. However, he was clear that, although faith was necessary in the recipient,

---

[269] Bernhard Lohse, *A Short History of Christian Doctrine*, trans. F. Ernest Stoeffler (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 172.
[270] *Ibid*, 42-3.
[271] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 32.

that faith did not bring about the presence of Christ. It was through the words of institution that the elements of bread and wine became the body and blood of Christ, not at the time of their reception by the communicant.[272] In his refusal to give an exact definition of the doctrine, but his exaltation of the sacrament as a whole, Feild joined with his fellow Tractarians, including the Tractarian Newman. Newman's sermon, "The State of Grace," about justification by grace, concludes with a discussion of the Eucharist. He affirms that Christ is present within the elements of communion, although not in the same way as understood by the Roman Catholics, but does not go into specifics of the manner of that presence. [273]

Overall, Tractarian writings did not include precise definitions of what was meant by the real presence of Christ, which they felt was "a most holy and supernatural mystery."[274] Some things were better left unexplained. Indeed, Tractarians had trouble when they attempted to expand on their understanding of the doctrine, for example the action taken against Pusey after he preached a sermon in 1843, entitled *The Holy Eucharist: a Comfort to the Penitent.*[275] He was attacked for his religious beliefs and was unable to preach for a period of two years. The doctrine of the real presence was "a subject of immense difficulty and importance," and Feild worked to ensure that his clergy did not make a decision about the doctrine of the real presence too easily for themselves.[276] Moreover, they were also to avoid acting uncharitably towards those who had different understandings of the sacrament.

---

[272] *Ibid*, 35.
[273] John Henry Newman, *Parochial and Plain Sermons,* Vol. IV (London: Longmans, Green, 1987), 147.
[274] Livingston, *Modern Christian Thought*, vol. 1, *Enlightenment and the Nineteenth Century*, 180.
[275] For a detailed discussion of this topic, see pages 22-3 above.
[276] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 41.

Confession as a Means to Examine One's Conscience

In order for the proper reception of the Eucharist, preparation was necessary so that the communicant approached the sacrament filled with faith and repentance. This could take place only after a thorough examination of one's conscience, confession of sins to God, and a firm promise of repentance. Confession was a solitary activity, and to God alone, but it was not expected that this would be sufficient for all. Feild did not believe that the Church of England expected everyone to be able to quiet his or her conscience through self-examination. Feild, and Pusey, were adamant that personal confession and absolution was an integral part of the faith and practice of the Church of England.[277] Not everyone was satisfied of the adequacy of their private confession to God, or felt assured of his forgiveness; therefore, additional counsel was required. It was only logical that the counsel requested was that of the priest since no one could better assist the lay people in their spiritual needs. The individual approached the priest in order to be prepared to receive the Eucharist after the confession of sins, reception of absolution, and pardon and forgiveness.[278] In order to meet the needs of those within his diocese, Feild sought to recover the traditional Church of England practice of auricular confession despite possible objections from opponents who conflated it with Roman Catholic confession.

During the worship service, the congregation made a general confession, although to God alone, and the priest gave a public pronouncement of absolution. Feild recognized that trouble arose when the practice of confession and absolution shifted from the congregation to the individual. It was when confession took place privately and

[277] Liddon, *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey*, vol. 3, 4th ed. (London: Longmans, Green, 1898), 94.
[278] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 50.

absolution was granted on a particular basis that the opponents of this practice linked it with the Roman Catholic sacrament. This took place most publicly in the 1850s in Newfoundland, because of the actions taken by Reverend William Kepple White, of Harbour Buffett. Although congregants of Harbour Buffett were traditionally Evangelical, Reverend White followed the Tractarian practices of his bishop. In 1851, White made the administration of communion to the dying Edith Kirby contingent upon auricular confession, and controversy ensued as a result.[279] Feild addressed this very question in 1866, when he pointed out that, unlike the practice of the Roman Catholic Church, confession to a priest within the Church of England was not compulsory. It was an invitation only, to those members of the congregation who were in need of extra assistance to quiet their consciences.[280] The significance of auricular confession was recognized in the *Book of Common Prayer*, and Feild and Tractarians such as Pusey who employed it, did so in order to meet the needs of the laity. Pusey had not always favoured confession, but, by 1846, he had advocated a systematic use of auricular confession.[281]

Matrimony, a Sacramental Institution

When a man and a woman came together in marriage, they took part in a deeply religious ceremony: the sacrament of matrimony. God ordained this union of two individuals, and the sacrament served to glorify God through a demonstration of God's love. Marriage was not something to be approached lightly, because of its sanctity and indissoluble nature. A woman and man left their parents and formed a new family; they were no longer separate people, but "one flesh" (Matt. 19:4-6). During the marriage

[279] Hollett, "Evangelicals versus Tractarians," 251.
[280] *Ibid*, 52.
[281] Nockles, *Oxford Movement in Context*, 250.

ceremony, the man and the woman conferred the sacrament upon each other. Aside from joining two people together, matrimony illustrated a larger religious concept. Feild felt that the sacrament showed the mystical union that existed between Christ and his Church.[282] *Tract 73*, written in 1836 by Newman, centering upon the status of reason in religion, concurred with this understanding that marriage was a "mystery" and represented more than simply the union between a man and a woman.[283] For all of those reasons, the proper province of matrimony was the church, and not the state. Marriage was not civil, but religious, bound up with the priest, located within the sacred precincts of the church, with vows made in the name of God.

Practice

Upon arrival in his diocese, and throughout his years as bishop, Feild noted variations regarding the solemnization of matrimony. He was concerned to ensure that there was uniformity of practice in the administration of the sacrament by all of his clergy. Feild disliked the existing local custom of celebrating marriage at any time of the year. He strongly wished that matrimony was celebrated within the canonical hours, and not at any arbitrary time chosen by the parties involved.[284] That his clergy did not feel as strongly as Feild did about this was seen by Feild's repetition of his request. What disturbed Feild the most was the practice of marriage during Lent and the week before Easter, or Holy Week. Marriage at this time was very inappropriate since the sacrament was the occasion for holy festivity, and it did not belong within a season of solemnity and fasting.[285] Although Feild wanted his priests to quickly change their practice and only

---

[282] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 36.
[283] "Tracts for the Times." http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/index.html
[284] *Order and Uniformity*, 25.
[285] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland ... 1847*, 16.

perform the sacrament during the canonical hours, there were priests in Bermuda who continued to ignore the bishop's wishes almost twenty-two years after Feild's arrival in his diocese. Feild let his clergy know that his request had its basis in the practice of the wider church and was not something he had imposed for its own sake. By only allowing marriage within Lent and the week preceding Easter in cases of urgent necessity, Feild was following the traditions of the Church of England.[286] He could not understand why the Church of England in Bermuda would ignore the traditions of its mother church.

Since the Church of England was not the established church in Newfoundland, the parish system did not exist there. This affected the sacrament of marriage because, Feild felt, the absence of parishes made it impossible to publish marriage banns properly.[287] Feild was conscious of this lack and impressed upon his clergy that it was their responsibility to make careful enquiries regarding the persons to be married. The priest needed to ensure that he did not marry two people whose religious or civil impediments made marriage illegal or improper.[288] Matrimony was a sacrament of the church and, as such, it was vital that it was performed with full regard of its true status.

Civil Intervention in the Sacrament of Matrimony

Since marriage was a religious ceremony and a sacrament within the Church of England, the civil authorities had no business being involved in its administration. Marriage was legislated by canon law and any civil legislation regarding marriage was inappropriate. The English legislature did not go along with this, and, in the middle decades of the nineteenth century, altered the marriage laws. The most significant

---

[286] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1866*, 18.
[287] The banns of marriage (banns) were announcements that a marriage was to take place. They were published in order to prevent marriages that were legally invalid.
[288] *Order and Uniformity*, 25.

changes to the English marriage laws took place in 1857, when jurisdiction over marriages was removed from the ecclesiastical courts.[289] Until this point in time, marriage remained outside the sphere of the civil courts, because it was an institution sanctioned by the church. With the change in jurisdiction, marriages were considered civil contracts and divorce was made much easier. Before 1857 in England, the dissolution of a marriage was only possible after the passing of an Act of Parliament, a long and expensive process. The alteration in the marriage laws took place with no regard for what members of the Church of England, especially those holding to a Tractarian understanding of the sacraments, saw as the sacred nature of marriage. At this time, Keble strongly expressed his opposition to the divorce proposals by writing two pamphlets in which he set down his understanding of the sacred and indissoluble nature of marriage.[290] In addition, changes were made regarding affinity, those tables that stated who could, or could not, marry, due to blood or other relationships.

In both cases, affinity and divorce, alterations to the marriage laws contradicted the Scriptures. When a man and a woman were joined together in matrimony, they became "one flesh" for all time (Matt. 19:4-6). Because of Feild's understanding of this "oneness," he could not conceive of alterations to the table of affinity, specifically the particular part of the law that forbade marriage to a man's deceased wife's sister.[291] Since a man and his wife were one, her sister became his, and any such marriage would be incestuous. Feild could only conceive that this change took place through a disregard for the sacredness of the sacrament of matrimony. In addition, due to marriage making

---

[289] Chadwick, *Victorian Church*, vol.1, *Part One: 1829-1859*, 481.
[290] Edward Frederick Lindley Wood, Earl of Halifax, *John Keble,* new ed. (Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1932), 145.
[291] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 38.

two people into "one flesh," divorce was impossible, no matter if civil authorities legislated otherwise. As Feild pointed out to his Newfoundland clergy, the rule to be followed by ministers of the Church of England was not that found within civil legislation but the words of Christ, specifically the verse "what God has joined together, let man not separate" (Matt. 19:6).[292] The laws of God were of highest importance and superseded the laws of the state at any time when the two were in conflict.

Marriage was a church sacrament and, as such, the only appropriate individuals to solemnize it were the clergy. In Feild's conception of the sacrament, marriage that took place without "any appeal to God, or any regard to the place of celebrating the service," was not "holy" matrimony.[293] Lay marriage served to diminish the reverence given to the sacrament and was not marriage as understood in its proper religious sense. Marriage by lay hands did not take place for religious benefits but for the securing of secular ones, and Feild considered it only a civil contract.[294] Those married civilly were not eligible for the spiritual blessings gained through the sacrament of marriage. The only way to return the people to a correct conception of marriage was to strengthen within them a higher view of all the sacraments, and specifically that of the sacrament of matrimony. Although lay marriage was made possible by the secular government, the state still saw marriage as a sacrament, at least in the estimation of Keble. He did emphasize that the government needed to respect the laws of the church governing this sacrament; such laws, he and Feild both saw as outside the government's domain.[295]

---

[292] *Ibid*, 37.
[293] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 36.
[294] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 62.
[295] Wood, *John Keble*, 145.

Summary

Feild and Tractarians paid special attention to the sacraments of the Church of England, especially baptism and the Eucharist. The latter two were crucial in a Christian's life because they were necessary for salvation. He did not insist that his clergy hold a particular theological understanding of the Eucharist, but permitted differing views of the nature of Christ's presence in the sacrament as long as the real presence was affirmed. Baptism gave the soul its spiritual birth, confirmation welcomed the believer into membership in the Church of England, communion fed the believer, confession was a necessary preparation for communion, and marriage joined two into one and marked the mystical union between Christ and the church. Feild believed that Church of England clergy signified their understanding of the high status due the sacraments by administering them according to the instructions found in the *Book of Common Prayer*. By moving away from local practice to a more strict interpretation of the Church of England rubrics, more thought was given to the "awesome" nature of the sacraments in the minds of the clergy and laity. Sacraments were expressions of God's grace and outward signs of an inward reality. The sacramentalism of Feild linked the spiritual to the material and found visible expression within the Diocese of Newfoundland. For Feild, it followed that if the sacrament was revered, the means of its administration was equally valued and a high estimation of the sacraments inevitably led to an increased estimation of the instruments of their administration.

Chapter 6 Church Architecture in Feild's Diocese

Tractarian Spirituality and Church Architecture

That a church building is qualitatively different from other buildings needed to be shown in its architectural exterior and internal design. As followers of the Oxford Movement paid increased attention to the patterns of worship conducted within the church, greater care was taken with the building itself. Feild's Tractarian theology is expressed in the patterns of worship and through the external architecture and internal design of the church buildings he erected in his diocese. The spiritual and the material inextricably joined in Feild's sacramentalism so that he was as concerned with architectural reform within his diocese as he was with liturgical reform. Tractarians like Feild placed great emphasis on the sacraments, especially on the Eucharist, but were not as concerned with preaching. With this shift of emphasis in church services, the significance of the pulpit declined in importance and that of the altar rose. The altar, being "the end and object, the crown and reward of all" became also the focus within the church.[296] This increased attention to the doctrine and practice of the Eucharist resulted in church renovation and different ways of designing new churches.

In the same way that Tractarians looked to the past to regain a more Catholic notion of worship and liturgy, they did also with church architecture. Since the extant architecture of the eighteenth, and early nineteenth, centuries did not allow for the full expression of Tractarian sacramentalism, the turn was made to Gothic architecture. Gothic was considered more English than the prevailing Georgian architecture, and its medievalism helped John Mason Neale and other adherents of the Cambridge Movement

[296] Feild, *Means and Methods of a Christian's Life*, 13.

to stress the linkage between the current Church of England and the historical Catholic Church.[297] The Gothic style was not chosen as the proper manner of church design because there was a widespread contemporary interest in Gothic architecture. Unlike Georgian architecture with its secular orientation, Gothic emerged from a time of faith and came into existence because of the religious needs of Christianity. Gothic was ideal for church design because, as pointed out by Hurrell Froude, right belief was connected to right design, and Gothic was the embodiment of a purer Catholic faith.[298] It was vital to choose the most adequate mode of architecture for church renovation and construction since there was a marriage between the inward and the outward, between the grace of God and the expression of that grace. The church housed the community of believers, also termed "the church," during the worship experience and, with the administration of the sacrament of communion, in some inexplicable manner, housed God as well. As Feild understood the subject, it was impossible to obey the commandment to love God without also giving due reverence to God's sanctuary. It was God who in Leviticus 19:30 commanded reverence for the church as his sanctuary.[299] One entered holy ground upon entering a church and, thus, any such entrance needed the accompaniment of reverence and devout behaviour. Because the church was the sanctuary of God, no aspect of its design or construction, no matter how seemingly minor, was without value. It was impossible to think about church architecture or construction without at the same time considering spirituality. Form was a reflection of devotion.

Feild's Policy on Erecting Churches

Because of his sacramentalist thought, Feild had a very strong understanding of

[297] Rowell, *Vision Glorious*, 104.
[298] Brendon, *Hurrell Froude*, 54.
[299] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 15.

the proper form of church design fixed in his mind before he arrived in his new diocese. He expressed his interest in church building and restoration first in Kidlington, his earliest parish. Feild took notice of the state into which the parish church had fallen, initiated its repair, and reordered its internal design. At the same time, he demonstrated his lifelong dislike of the customary system of pew rents through the addition of two hundred "free and unappropriated" seats to the Kidlington church.[300] Feild continued this campaign of church repair, and, as bishop in his new diocese, developed a policy for the erection of new churches. During his years as bishop, Feild promoted the renovation of existing churches as well as the construction of new ones. He was greatly concerned with the minutest details of church design in order to enhance the worship experience and to increase the reverence with which the laity approached Christian worship. It was not enough that churches be solidly constructed, but with little to distinguish them from other buildings; it was necessary that "symbols and signs be exhibited of ... Christian faith and hope."[301] The people might not have much money, but Feild encouraged sacrifices so that the church received its necessary due.

Feild championed the construction of churches in localities where they had not previously existed, but also replaced buildings where the congregation had outgrown them. An increase in congregation size was considered as indicating an increase in the spirituality of a particular community. Feild felt it imperative that all who wished to attend the public services of the Church of England were able to do so. He was greatly concerned that the churches within his diocese be large enough to accommodate their congregations and any visitors. The bishop disliked situations where part of a

[300] Jones, "Making of a Colonial Bishop," 7. For a more detailed discussion of pew rents and Tractarian opposition to them, see page 128-9 below.
[301] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 22.

congregation was excluded through lack of accommodation; such accommodation was "every one's duty to desire, and every one's right to partake."[302] His worry was especially for the poorer members of the congregation who were unable to afford the customary pew rents. It also did not help to see private pews locked and empty when the rest of the church was packed to the rafters. By renovating churches to increase the accommodation available, Feild was able to prevent numbers of his people from leaving the Church of England because there was no room for them to join in corporate worship.

Feild and the Cambridge Camden Society

Although he was greatly concerned with the design and furnishings of churches within his diocese, Feild did not view himself as an innovator. He was not bringing something new to the church in Newfoundland and Bermuda, but what he considered a return to requirements specified in the canons and rubrics of the Church of England. The bishop was familiar with the ideals of the Cambridge Camden Society, a society founded five years before he left England. It was through this familiarity that Feild knew which architectural designs conformed to appropriate canonical requirements. Although the bishop would have known of the society because of its popularity in England, he gained a greater understanding of the society because of his friendship with Reverend William Scott. Feild had an extensive correspondence with Scott that covered a number of years. In this correspondence, he informed Scott about various aspects of life in Newfoundland and requested books and other items that were unavailable in St. John's. Scott was not only a long-time member of the Cambridge Camden Society, he was editor of the *Christian Remembrancer*, a journal established in 1841 for the promotion of Tractarian

[302] *Ibid*, 9.

High Church principles.[303]

The society turned the theories of the Oxford Movement into concrete expressions through the employment of Gothic Revival architecture as the appropriate style for churches. It was determined to bring into the contemporary Church of England the profound spirituality that the society found within medieval Gothic architecture. The medieval period contained a depth of symbolic and aesthetic richness, which the society felt was lacking in the church of the day. Members of the society thought it necessary to reintroduce the population to this sense of reverence toward God and the church.[304] Feild concurred, as he was always concerned that the lay people of his diocese were not conscious enough of their duty toward God and the awe due to God, the church, and the clergy. Sunday was not a day for Newfoundlanders to employ themselves in the fishery, but, rather, a day to fill themselves with the great truths of Christianity as expressed in the public worship services of the Church of England. Alterations in the fabric and furniture of Newfoundland churches had the purpose of coming closer to the ideals of the Cambridge Camden Society, with the result of "increased and increasing reverence and regard for the House of Prayer and our [Church of England] holy services."[305]

At the end of Feild's episcopate, the majority of churches in his diocese had what he considered at least some improvement in their design and furniture. He had begun this task of architectural improvement even before he landed in St. John's, as can be seen from a letter to Scott from Halifax in which he requested "useful modern ecclesiastical

---

[303] G. Le G. Norgate, "Scott, William (1813–1872)," rev. N. W. James, in *Oxford Dictionary of Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24937 (accessed 17 April 2007).
[304] Dale Adelmann, preface to *The Contribution of Cambridge Ecclesiologists to the Revival of Anglican Choral Worship 1839-62* (Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 1997), ix.
[305] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 69.

books of architecture" and "good designs of wooden churches."[306] Feild did not travel directly from England to St. John's, as he spent two weeks in Halifax where he met with Bishop Inglis. Feild's request for such architectural works even before his arrival in the diocese shows that the Tractarian principles espoused by the Cambridge Camden Society had not yet found expression in Nova Scotia, let alone in Newfoundland. The spiritual state of the Church of England within his diocese was not one with which he was at all content. Throughout his tenure as bishop, Feild did everything possible to raise the spirituality of his Church of England parishioners. In the work of church construction and renovation, he was greatly assisted by the presence and labours of Reverend William Grey. Grey was a graduate of Oxford, colonial secretary of the Oxford Architectural Society, diocesan architect, and, if only for a short time, principal of Queen's College in St. John's.[307] During his time as principal, Grey instructed the future clergy of Newfoundland and Labrador in the proper manner of church architecture, that of the Gothic Revival. Thus, he ensured that Feild's particular understanding of church design was accepted throughout the diocese. Of the churches that Grey designed, St. James Church in Battle Harbour, Labrador, is the only one that has survived to this day and celebrates this year its 150th anniversary. Grey's skilfulness can be seen in the design of St. James which showed his ability to consider local limitations regarding skilled labour, the exclusive use of wood rather than stone, the harshness of the weather, as well as the ideals of the Cambridge Movement.[308] St. James Church was built in the Gothic Revival style with a tower at the west end and a chancel at the east. It was a small structure,

[306] Feild to William Scott, 1 July 1844. RNL Collection.
[307] For more information on the life and activity of William Grey, see Patricia J. Leader, "The Hon. Reverend William Grey, MA." (M.T.S. thesis, Queen's College, 1998).
[308] For details on Grey's understanding of conditions within Newfoundland, see William Grey, "The Ecclesiology of Newfoundland," *The Ecclesiologist* 14 (June 1853): 156-61. For the full text of the article, see Appendix.

constructed with wood, as was typical for missionary churches in Labrador and Newfoundland. Since it was built by unskilled local labour, during periods of good weather, when they could spare the time away from the fishery, it was not completed quickly.[309] As Feild, and the Camden Cambridge Society, understood the subject, the priest was the proper person to be responsible for church architecture. Worship was not the responsibility of the laity, but of the clergy. Moreover, it followed that since changes to the fabric of the church were made to reflect liturgical reforms, the clergy needed to have final responsibility. This was especially true for Feild, since he held ultimate authority and responsibility as bishop of the diocese.

Consecration: for the Glory of God

In order for a church building of the Church of England to achieve its full potential, it was necessary that it be set apart from common purposes for all eternity. Such a setting aside took place through the service of consecration. This service dedicated the building to God's glory. In the Church of England, books, communion vessels, and land meant for graveyards, were similarly consecrated. Once consecration occurred, it was, according to Feild, not possible for the objects sanctified to return to common use. Although consecration did not physically alter buildings or land, consecrated objects acquired a different character for members of the Church of England. This character was attained through the understanding that the land or building in question now had a religious use and, thus, all members of the congregation would treat it differently after consecration.[310] Consecration, while it may not necessarily have had a

[309] Leader, "Reverend William Grey, MA," 99-100.
[310] Edward Feild, *An Address Delivered at the Consecration of the Mortuary Chapel in the St. John's Cemetery, on the 31st day of December, 1859* (St. John's: John T. Burton, 1860), 8.

legal effect, did affect believers on a moral basis. Feild made certain to remind his clergy that the Church of England held a doctrine of relative holiness. He understood by this doctrine that certain places and things acquired holiness through their relation to the persons who frequented or used them.[311] The ground or building was transformed through the believer's faith, who approached them with a serious regard for the glory of God.

One of his first official actions of a concrete religious nature in his new diocese was the bishop's setting aside of a piece of land for Christian burial. This activity took place even before the construction of a church. By spending the time and energy required to clear, and fence, a plot of land for a graveyard, the inhabitants of a particular mission demonstrated the seriousness of their faith. Feild looked upon this activity with favour because, to him, it illustrated the people's apprehension of the "great doctrines of our [Church of England] Creed, 'the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come.'"[312] Although the majority of the laity did not fully understand Church of England doctrine, they revered the rites and ceremonies of the church that Feild had always promoted.

Just as those who prepared land for a Church of England graveyard did so with an understanding of the religious function that the land would have, so, too, did those who donated land for that expressed purpose. Land in the missions of Newfoundland and Labrador was often donated to provide a site for a Church of England graveyard or church. The donors understood that their gift was for a sacred, religious use and, therefore, limited to those of the Church of England faith. Feild felt it necessary that his

---

[311] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 26.
[312] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 7.

clergy keep always in mind the restrictive nature of such donations, whether or not the restrictions were explicit. The consecration service helped with this since, as a Church of England service, it was necessarily exclusive. The service not only promoted the true faith of Christianity, as Feild saw it, but also barred all who had corrupted that faith.[313] Church of England graveyards and churches were only open to those of that faith, and not to the members and ministers of other denominations. Allowing clergy of any sect indiscriminate access to Church of England churches and graveyards, offended against common order and decency.[314] Furthermore, Feild never permitted such openness because the Church of England was the only valid expression of Christianity in existence. Allowing the churches and churchyards of his diocese open to those not of the Church of England, corrupted the expression of the faith.

It was here that Feild's exclusionary practice concerning churches within his diocese demonstrated his Tractarianism and went against local Newfoundland practice. Since they believed that the Church of England represented the only true expression of Christianity and celebrated the liturgy by validly ordained ministers, Tractarians were unable to work with other denominations, let alone share churches or graveyards. Feild understood buildings, once consecrated as Church of England churches, to be limited to services of the Church of England only. That had not been the custom in Newfoundland before his arrival. Since Church of England clergy were not the only clergymen present in Newfoundland, the people did not consider them uniquely qualified to administer the sacraments or preach the gospel. In the past, buildings had often been set aside as churches for "any 'good man that comes along' to officiate or 'hold forth' in," not for

[313] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 24.
[314] *Ibid*, 25.

clergy only, or those of one denomination only.[315] Through this custom, all of the inhabitants of a particular area within the colony were able to employ the same building for Christian worship. Time, energy, and resources were saved because multiple churches were not necessary. A short-lived example of this sharing of resources was Christ Church in Quidi Vidi. It was built in 1834 by a group of Anglicans, Methodists, and Congregationalists, for their joint use.[316]

This custom of the sharing of worship space could not, and did not, find favour with Feild. Although he did preach and administer the sacraments in such locations, he understood that a building only became a church through consecration, and then it was solely devoted to the Church of England. On his many voyages of visitation around Newfoundland and to the coast of Labrador, Feild consecrated both churches and graveyards. He even had the honour, on 10 July 1853, at St. Francis Harbour, of consecrating the first church, of any communion, on the southern coast of Labrador.[317] Throughout his almost twenty-three years as bishop, Feild consecrated over fifty churches. Most of those churches had what he felt to be a superior construction compared with those of the past, and the majority included the necessities of silver communion vessels and a stone font.[318]

Church Architecture and Design

In England, one could examine churches and church ruins that were centuries old.

---

[315] Edward Feild, *Voyage of Visitation in the "Hawk" Church Ship*, 34. This was the case in Port aux Basques.
[316] "Christ Church (Quidi Vidi, St. John's)," *Newfoundland & Labrador's Registered Heritage Structures* (2004) http://www.heritage.nf.ca/society/rhs/rs_listing/205.html (accessed 18 May 2007).
[317] Edward Feild, *A Journal of the Bishop of Newfoundland's Voyage of Visitation on the Coast of Labrador and the North-east Coast of Newfoundland in the Church Ship, "Hawk," in the Year 1853,* Church in the Colonies, no. 30 (London: Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1854), 34.
[318] Feild, *Plea for Colonial Dioceses*, 35.

England also had architects and builders trained in the design and construction of churches. When the publications of the Cambridge Camden Society circulated throughout the British Isles, individuals from both professions were able to adapt to this new arbiter of correct design. Feild found that the situation was much different in Newfoundland. Since, for most of its history, Newfoundland's main industry was the fishery, there was a paucity of individuals skilled in many of the trades necessary for proper church construction. In addition, the overwhelming majority of buildings, including churches, were constructed of wood, and not of stone. This had much to do with the relative cheapness of wood, as well as the lack of skilled stone-workers. Members of the Cambridge Camden Society encouraged the development of set guidelines for church design applicable to locations worldwide.[319] Since the situation in Newfoundland differed greatly from that with which he was familiar with in England, Feild was fortunate that he was able to draw upon the knowledge of William Grey. Grey pointed out that it was "of little use to send home for designs to persons who do not know our manner of building, or the climate of Newfoundland."[320] The ecclesiological principles of the Cambridge Camden Society were indeed adaptable to Newfoundland and Bermuda, but only with the assistance of someone who understood both architecture and local conditions.

Church Buildings

The churches that Feild discovered upon arrival in his diocese were centered on the pulpit and reading desk; they were "preaching boxes" and not constructed for the proper administration of the sacraments.[321] Feild recognized that the wooden edifices that served as churches in his diocese could not approximate the symbolism "of ancient

[319] Brandwood, "'Fond of Church Architecture,'" 55.
[320] Grey, "Ecclesiology of Newfoundland," 158.
[321] Webster, ed., intro. to '*Temples... Worthy of His Presence,*' 14.

Churches, where the minutest ornaments had their particular and appropriate significance."[322] He did not waver in his determination to improve church design wherever possible and necessary. It was not necessary to tear down existing churches and begin anew in order to shift the emphasis in church architecture from the preaching boxes of the past to physical expressions of the sacraments. The addition of a chancel enlarged the size of a church and moved the focus in worship from preaching to the administration of the sacraments, since the chancel housed the altar. Feild was pleased to note, in his last Charge of 1866, that most new churches within his diocese were built with a chancel, and many older churches had added one.[323]

Although Feild knew how he wanted the churches in his diocese to look, it was not practical that he, or Grey, would personally oversee all construction. It was necessary that plans be drawn up that were simple enough for local artisans to follow. By 1853, in his capacity as diocesan architect, Grey had produced designs for eight new churches and for the modification of two others.[324] These plans expressed the liturgical reform championed by the Cambridge Camden Society. At the same time, they took into consideration local weather conditions, accessible materials, and the skill of available workers. Feild was not willing to allow church construction to continue upon its customary course, and he greatly benefited from Grey's architectural and liturgical expertise in carrying out of this reform of church architecture.

Although the churches in Feild's diocese, and especially those of Newfoundland, were of wood, it did not mean that they necessarily had to be a square box, identical to the other buildings in a particular locality. The design and construction of a church that

---

[322] *Order and Uniformity*, 13.
[323] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 60.
[324] Grey, "Ecclesiology of Newfoundland," 159.

was correct in form and arrangement, served as a concrete expression of Feild's sacramentalist understanding of Church of England religiosity. One such church was Trinity Church of Hamilton, Bermuda, which testified to the community that God was honoured and the spiritual life of its congregation was at a high level.[325] This church was located in the principal town of the island and shone as an example of proper ecclesiastical architecture for all to see. The church was designed in the form of a cross and its transept reminded the people of the arms of Christ upon the cross. The entrance was at the west, the pulpit was in the nave, and the focal point of Trinity Church was the altar at its eastern extremity.[326]

Since the material was a reflection of the spiritual, the form of a church reflected its function and purpose. Correct external architectural form served to illustrate the proper profession of worship that was conducted within such a church. Laity and clergy signified their understanding of this through their willingness to commit by following Feild in his understanding of the proper manner of church design. Feild was pleased to note one such priest, Rev. Augustus Edwin Cawley Bayly, who proved his devotion to the Church of England, and his acceptance of Tractarian ideals, by the construction of two churches. Feild promoted Bayly from being a missionary to Bonavista to that of becoming the first rural dean of Bonavista Bay, because, among other things, the churches Bayly constructed in Aquaforte and Bonavista were both pleasing in appearance and "suitable to the requirements" of the local people.[327] Through attempts to design churches that externally and internally reflected a sacramental understanding of Christian worship, reverence was shown to God and love to the people.

---

[325] Feild, *Means and Methods of a Christian's Life*, 11.
[326] *Ibid*, 12-3.
[327] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... 1866*, 14.

The Architecture of St. John's Cathedral

Although it was important that every church within Feild's diocese be correct in outward design and construction, it was even more so with regard to the cathedral in St. John's. A cathedral was the central church of a diocese since it was the seat of a bishop, housing his chair, or throne. It also contained a chapter, an ecclesiastical body that assisted the bishop in governing the diocese. Because of all of this, it was necessary that the cathedral of St. John's be worthy of its position and reflect, with all possible glory, both Feild's episcopal office, a distinguishing mark of Anglicanism, and his Tractarian sacramentalist understanding of Church of England worship. Feild's cathedral also served as a marker of his Tractarian understanding of the Church of England as opposed to the Roman Catholic cathedral, which was an identity marker of ultramontanism. Feild was not the first to draw up plans for a Church of England cathedral in St. John's; Bishop Aubrey George Spencer did so before him. Spencer was also concerned that worship reached its proper status within the diocese, but his emphasis was not the sacramentalism of Feild. Spencer wished for a cathedral in St. John's in order that there was a church "devoted to the pure and evangelical worship" of God; not so much a church devoted to the proper administration of the sacraments.[328] A cathedral was all the more necessary since the existing church was in such a poor condition that it did nothing to help the congregation promote a sense of the reverence required for public worship in the Church of England. Spencer had formed a building committee and approved architectural plans drawn up for the proposed cathedral, although construction had not begun before he left

[328] Aubrey George Spencer, *The Church of God: a Sermon on Acts XX, 28, Preached in the Parish Church of St. John's, Newfoundland, on Good Friday, 1842* (St. John's: John W. McCoubrey, 1842), 20.

the diocese for Jamaica.[329]

The existence of a cathedral building committee demonstrates a major difference between Spencer and Feild regarding the importance given to architectural correctness. Spencer did not take sole responsibility for the cathedral, while Feild was greatly concerned with all aspects of church design. Feild inherited the plans for the proposed St. John's cathedral from his predecessor. It was the contractor, James Purcell, a local builder, who had drawn up the architectural sketches, and Feild convinced the building committee to send them to England to obtain the advice of knowledgeable English authorities.[330] It was only logical that, in the case of such a major project as the construction of his cathedral, Feild wished to ensure that its architecture was the best expression of his sense of the Church of England. Feild was not enamoured with Purcell for reasons that had nothing to do with his abilities in architectural design. Purcell was both Irish and a Roman Catholic and had been contracted by the Roman Catholic Bishop Fleming to superintend the building of his cathedral, none of which recommended Purcell to Feild.[331] Although not specified in the report of the building committee, it can be assumed that the "authorities" mentioned were members of the Cambridge Camden Society. This assumption is confirmed by Feild's correspondence with William Scott. Feild wished to convey his thanks to the society for reporting on Purcell's drawings for the proposed cathedral. Feild was decidedly against Purcell's plans and felt that "no one who had ever seen a decent church could tolerate such an abortion."[332] Such a comment suggested that the opinion of the society was not favourable to Mr. Purcell. The decision

---

[329] *Report of the Cathedral Building Committee, with the Treasurer's Account, to 1st October, 1844* (St. John's: Ryan and Withers, 1844), 2.
[330] *Ibid*, 6.
[331] Leader, "Reverend William Grey, MA," 96-7.
[332] Feild to William Scott, 22 August 1844. RNL Collection.

was made not to go with the plans that Bishop Spencer had approved, but to begin again with someone else.

The individual chosen by Feild was George Gilbert Scott, 1811-1878, a leading church architect and a Tractarian.[333] Unlike Purcell, Scott designed a cathedral that was acceptable to Feild. The architectural design took into consideration the principles of the Cambridge Camden Society and illustrated Feild's, and the society's, sacramentalist religious thought. It was no mere "preaching box," but a striking Gothic structure, although with a simplicity of outline and detail. Along with local stone, the cathedral included limestone from Ireland and sandstone from Scotland.[334] Importing stone may have added to the cost of construction, but was necessary if the cathedral was to represent Feild's ideal of a model church. As a Gothic building, the architectural design of the cathedral was in a cruciform shape, with a central nave and transept. The cathedral was designed with the chancel and sanctuary as the focal point at the eastern end of the building, flanked by a lady chapel and a sacristy. The main entrance was set at the western end of the church, where was placed the stone font, and the altar at the easternmost point. The plan of the cathedral contained no galleries, since they were something Feild opposed, as well as being contrary to the ideals of the Cambridge Camden Society.

Although Scott was commissioned to build the cathedral, he did not travel to St. John's to do so. His local representative was William Hay, 1818-1888, whom Scott

---

[333] Gavin Stamp, "Scott, Sir George Gilbert (1811–1878)," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24869 (accessed 18 April 2007). Not to be confused with his son, George Gilbert Scott, 1839-1897.

[334] Harold Kalman, *A Concise History of Canadian Architecture* (Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 2000), 230.

commissioned as clerk of works.[335] Hay was an architect himself, and his employment to superintend the cathedral construction was a means of saving time and money, since Hay was able to solve locally any architectural problems that arose. This removed the need to constantly contact Scott and wait for his reply. Hay would have been congenial to Scott and Feild because he was also, as he put it himself, "devoted to the study of Ecclesiastical architecture."[336] Hay served in the capacity of clerk of works until the nave of the cathedral was finished in 1850, and then consecrated as a cathedral. Although construction of the entire cathedral had not concluded, consecration took place because there was the necessity for a cathedral church in St. John's. Feild felt that the construction so far had been "well and faithfully executed," and the cathedral, as far as it was completed, was "admired by all who have seen it."[337] The Church of England cathedral of St. John's was a massive stone structure; its Gothic architectural design, a concrete expression of Feild's sacramental religious understanding.

Internal Design, Construction, and Furnishing of a Church

Perhaps even more than its exterior, the interior fabric of a church was designed to reflect a particular understanding of Christian worship. In Tractarian churches, there was an interplay between worship, sacraments, and the internal design and layout of the church. Since Feild was a sacramentalist and strongly encouraged his clergy to follow his religious outlook, their churches needed to reflect this understanding and enable a correct administration of the sacraments. Existing churches, with their rented pews, galleries, and multi-level pulpits, were not satisfactory. Instead, Feild refocused attention on the altar

[335] Leader, "Reverend William Grey, MA," 77.
[336] Hay to Edward Feild, 7 September 1846, RNL Collection.
[337] Feild, *Plea for Colonial Dioceses*, 35.

and the font, as symbols of the two highest sacraments of Christianity. The interior of his cathedral had such a layout, and Feild was not willing to alter those plans to placate possible resistance. Feild's cathedral did indeed arouse hostility, and reports were published, decrying, especially, its service of consecration. What was opposed was "the raised altar, the credence table, the two lighted candles [on the altar], and the surpliced clergy."[338] Those were all items of Tractarian significance and worrisome to a Church of England population that opposed anything that even hinted of Roman Catholicism.

Layout and Furniture within the Church

Churches in England and in the colonies had traditionally focussed on the pulpit, since the central act of the worship service was the sermon. Pulpits were complicated structures, grew to immense heights, and had a number of levels. They overwhelmed the interiors of churches, casting all else into the shade. Reverend William Scott, Feild's close friend and correspondent, was one member of the Cambridge Movement who rearranged the interior of his church to reflect his sacramentalist sensibility. He brought the altar into "due prominence," and substituted, for the traditional "three-decker" amalgamation of reading desk and pulpit, "on one side of the church a light and more suitable pulpit, and on the other a reading desk."[339] Those priests of the Church of England who were not willing, or saw no need, to modify their church interiors in that way, identified themselves as Evangelicals, and continued to stress the sermon above the sacraments. There was no fear that Feild would be identified with such priests, although he did not denigrate the sermon, because it enabled the congregation to hear the preaching of God's word.

---

[338] Jones, "Early Opposition," 37.
[339] Gordon Huelin, "A Tractarian Clergyman and His Friends," *Church Quarterly Review* 160, no. 334 (1959): 39.

Later in life, Feild gave a sermon on the *Means and Method of a Christian's Life*, as they were seen in the architectural design and furniture of a Christian church. Churches were to have an eastern orientation, by which was meant that the entrance was at the west, and the altar, the most sacred part of the church, was at the easternmost point. At the main entrance of the church was the font, to teach the believer that Christian life began with the sacrament of baptism. The chancel was at the eastern end of the church, housing the altar, the believer's final destination. Its easterly location was significant since it reminded the Christian of whence came the source "of all we know, and believe, and hope for."[340] Each aspect of church design had significance; as the house of God, construction or furnishing could not take place without constant consideration of this.

Because of the customary system of renting out pews, the best seats in the church were limited to those who had the most money. The poor were relegated to galleries, or forced out of the church altogether. Feild disliked galleries because they cramped the interior of a church and prevented available light from entering a church. Galleries did nothing to promote good behaviour on the part of the congregation, thus the bishop discouraged them except when there was no other means of adding seats to a church. By abolishing the system of pew rents, no matter how enshrined in custom, every opportunity was made for the poor of a particular area to attend the public worship services of the Church of England. In his staunch opposition to rented pews and galleries, the bishop joined with members of the Cambridge Movement. Both Feild and members of the Cambridge Camden Society saw that this attack was second in importance only to the defence of chancels.[341] Feild would not accept anything within the church that took

[340] Feild, *Means and Methods of a Christian's Life*, 12-3.
[341] Yates, *Buildings, Faith, and Worship*, 159.

away from the reverence that the people felt for the sacraments and the public services of worship. Since private pews and galleries did so, they needed to be removed, even though the pews brought income and the galleries provided additional accommodation.

Feild, being aware of the reverence that was due to the church, rearranged the furniture in the St. John's Church, which was eventually replaced by the cathedral, only two months after his arrival in the diocese. He moved the pulpit from the middle of the church, in front of the altar, where it had blocked the communion rails and the view of the altar, to the side of the church, against a pillar.[342] Feild's understanding of the communion service as the highest, and most important, service within the Church of England, would not allow him to accept the layout he inherited. Pulpits had to be brought back to earth, as the sermon returned to its appropriate, lesser, status within the worship service. Changes also needed to be made in the design of the church so that the altar was once again its focal point. The altar was elevated from the level of the rest of the church, so that it had the maximum possible visibility. Feild noted with thankfulness those churches in his diocese that signalled their understanding of the altar's proper importance by making "more commodious and handsome" the "approaches to and space about the Holy Table."[343] Such alterations made possible a more reverent administration of the sacrament of communion, because crowding was no longer an issue.

In order for a church to carry out its sacred duties, two items of furniture were essential. The first, and most important, was the altar, and the second, of only slightly lesser importance, was the font. The font was necessary in order that the sacrament of baptism could be correctly administered. In his early years as bishop, almost none of the

[342] *Order and Uniformity*, 10.
[343] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 11.

churches within Feild's diocese contained stone fonts, not even the principal church in St. John's. As he wrote to William Scott shortly after his arrival, the manner of performing baptisms in that church was "to bring in a basin with water and put it on the altar."[344] At one stroke, this disparaged two of the sacraments of the church, the Eucharist as well as baptism. In order to impress upon his clergy the necessity of fonts, he reminded them that the canons of the Church of England required the presence of a font of stone within every church.[345] The font was to be large enough for the immersion of an infant, as required for the right administration of baptism. It was placed at the western entrance of a church to signify that, through baptism, the individual joined the Christian church. Feild complained to Scott about a lack of stone fonts in churches even before arriving in St. John's. When Feild was in Halifax, he wrote Scott and requested a portable font be sent along with the communion plate for St. John's. At this time, Feild also let Scott know that the churches in Halifax did not contain stone fonts, but only "miserable" imitations.[346]

Adorning the Church Interior

Once the focal point within the church was the altar, it was only natural that it became ornamented. Clergy with a sacramental piety wanted to highlight the importance of the Eucharist by surrounding the altar "with all that was bright and glorious."[347] The communion vessels were made of silver, two candles were placed on the altar to signify the light brought into the world through Christ, as well as a monogrammed altar cloth, the latter causing considerable controversy for Feild in Bermuda. A majority of the vestry of a church in Paget's parish took it upon themselves to remove the cross from the "sacred

[344] Feild to William Scott, 11 July 1844. RNL Collection.
[345] *Order and Uniformity*, 11.
[346] Feild to William Scott, 1 July 1844. RNL Collection.
[347] Moorman, *History of the Church in England*, 365.

monogram" of a donated altar cloth. Feild thought that they took this action from a mistaken zeal to avoid all appearances of superstition, because members of the vestry thought the image of the cross signified Roman Catholic doctrine. However, once the congregation had accepted the cloth's donation, the vestry had no authority to call for its removal or alteration. This was so because a vestry was not qualified to judge the ornaments of a church since it could include dissenters.[348] The reason given by the vestry for the removal of the cross from the altar cloth was even less logical when it was recognized that the sacred monogram was also upon the church's communion plate, and on many of the altar cloths in churches throughout England.

Feild did not leave his clergy to decide on their own which ornaments to add to their churches and which were not appropriate. He pointed out to his Bermuda clergy that the correct ornaments were those in existence within English churches at the time of Edward the Sixth.[349] There was no explicit list of the various ornaments, and knowledge of them came from customs within the Church of England. Some of those ornaments had been adopted within one, or more, of the churches in Bermuda, proving that Feild's ornamental additions were not innovations at all. Included were the sacred monogram, containing the cross; 'two lights' on candlesticks upon the altar; pictures of the apostles and evangelists; windows painted with scriptural subjects; scrolls in the languages of Scripture, and carved chancel screens.[350] Feild saw the inclusion of one or of all of those ornaments within the churches of his diocese as indicators of the high spiritual disposition of the people.

As the principal church in the diocese, the cathedral in St. John's was a model for

[348] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda ... 1849*, 17.
[349] *Ibid*, 20.
[350] *Ibid*, 20-1.

the rest of Feild's clergy to emulate. The cathedral contained much ornamentation, which even spread to embellishment of the walls. The Ten Commandments and other scriptural texts upon the cathedral walls were in accordance with the canons of the Church of England and gained acceptance by the congregation. What was not accepted was the image of the cross, placed upon the cathedral wall near the altar, as "an embellishment representing the Tree of Life."[351] Unfortunately for Feild, some members of his congregation did not understand this use of the cross since they felt it should be avoided at all costs as a Roman Catholic symbol. Although he tried to indicate the ancient nature of the imagery of the cross, Feild did not prevail, and the image was replaced with a text.

Feild was willing to remove a church ornament in that particular case since it was an item that he had introduced into the cathedral and was not something in place from time immemorial. As well, the image of the cross was made a "general ground of offence," and it was only charitable to consent to its removal, although only after explaining the reason for its introduction in the first place.[352] Feild understood the ornamentation, which he brought into his cathedral and into the churches of the diocese, to enhance Christian worship, and it was aimed at increasing the sense of reverence on the part of the congregation. However, he did not force upon the people ornaments that were new to them and that, though valuable in themselves, caused dissension and general offence, and he ensured that his priests felt the same.

Summary

The typical church building within Feild's diocese at the commencement of his bishopric was the "preaching box" of long-standing popularity. Twenty-three years later,

[351] *Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland ... M.DCCC.LVIII*, 23.
[352] *Ibid*, 24.

most of these were replaced by churches designed and laid out in Gothic style, for the proper administration of the sacraments. The function of a church determined its form, and, as Feild changed the emphasis in worship within his diocese, so, too, did he change the physical fabric of the church. Feild erected many churches within his diocese and made sure that their construction followed the architectural ideals that he learned from the Cambridge Camden Society. Through the efforts of William Grey, the bishop was much assisted in the design and construction of church buildings. Grey drew up plans for missionary churches for local builders to follow and enabled Feild to be certain that they would be expressions of the ideals of the Cambridge Camden Society, despite a lack of direct supervision on his part. As a Tractarian, Feild had a strong sacramental religiosity, and this religious commitment required a commensurate religious practice. The Church of England deserved reverence from its clergy, who performed public worship services, and from the laity. Church of England lay people showed their regard to the church by frequent attendance at public worship, through reverent behaviour while within the church, and, by maintaining and suitably decorating the church.[353] The service of consecration set aside buildings and land for the sacred purpose of church and graveyard. The local custom of openness to all good men was replaced by Feild's understanding of the necessarily limiting nature of consecration. Since a church was different from all other buildings, appropriate ornamentation, ritual, and ceremony signified its sacred purpose and elevated the devotion of the congregation. Although his opponents might have disagreed, Feild did not introduce anything new, or Roman Catholic, into the churches of his diocese. Instead, he brought into the Church of England in Newfoundland, Labrador, and Bermuda, a more rigorous interpretation of what he

[353] Feild, *Plea for Reverent Behaviour in the House of God*, 7.

considered the arrangements and ritual of the rubrics of the *Book of Common Prayer.*[354] Since many of the rubrics had been in abeyance for a long period in the wider Church of England, Feild did not insist upon their adoption by his clergy, but strongly encouraged them to do so since such things showed proper reverence for the church. Feild bestowed much to the people of his diocese, including the churches constructed during his episcopacy. His greatest legacy was the St. John's Cathedral of St. John the Baptist, an immense Gothic Revival edifice that served as an exemplar of Feild's understanding of church design and construction. He took great pains that the cathedral would concretely express, in its architecture and furnishing, his Tractarian religious thought.

[354] Webster, "Postscript," 352.

Chapter 7 Conclusion

Edward Feild was the second bishop of the diocese of Newfoundland, which included the Archdeaconry of Bermuda, and his episcopate lasted over thirty years, from 1844-1876. He served as the personification of the Church of England in Newfoundland and Bermuda for those years, but the people of today have mostly forgotten him. When people consider him at all, it is regarding Feild's contributions to denominational education or his political activities, and not concerning his religiosity. In order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of Feild, study of his spirituality and theology is much needed. His religious posture was not simply that of a High Churchman, but was Tractarian, and his Tractarianism motivated his writings and actions. Feild's Tractarianism most clearly shone through his seven Charges to the clergy of Newfoundland and Bermuda; writings in which Feild communicated to his priests those issues that were of greatest importance to him at the time. The years 1844-1876 were years of much change and upheaval in Newfoundland and Bermuda, as they were in England, and the bishop was at the centre of much of that change. As bishop of Newfoundland, Feild had great responsibilities, as well as much power, and he remained mindful of both. During his episcopate, Feild worked to bring his Tractarian thought to concrete expression and paid little attention to his public opposition. His Tractarianism was augmented by an adoption of the architectural ideals of the Cambridge Movement as it best expressed his understanding of the Church of England. Considerations of Feild's writings, most especially his Charges to the clergy, and his activities, as well as the local context of Newfoundland and Bermuda, help to comprehend Feild's religious thought.

Feild's religious thought and activities were Tractarian, but any nuanced awareness of what was meant by this cannot be accomplished without some knowledge of the Oxford Movement and the Cambridge Movement. Feild attended Oxford, and most especially, the divinity lectures of Charles Lloyd, as did some of his Tractarian friends. He lived in the same period and wrestled with some of the same issues as they did. Although he did not attend Cambridge and become familiar with the Cambridge Camden Society in that way, he was a close friend of Reverend William Scott, a key member of the society. Tractarianism and the Cambridge Camden Society aimed at returning the Church of England to its more Catholic roots. They did so by paying renewed attention to liturgy and worship, the sacraments, episcopal authority and government, and architectural emphases that corresponded to their sacramentalist theology. Feild promoted the ideals and practices of both movements as he sought to bring about ecclesiastical changes within his diocese.

For Feild, the Church of England was not just a denomination within Christianity that was on an equal level with the rest; it was superior to all other divisions of the church that existed in his day. The Church of England could trace its lineage back to the apostles and had its authority from this very descent. It was part of an inviolate apostolic succession since the Church of England had not severed its link with Christ's historic church when it broke with Rome during the Reformation. The Church of England inherited the doctrine of the apostles through the succession of those they had ordained. Feild considered that only those whose ordination took place within such a succession had valid ministries. This point was very important for Tractarians since sacramental grace did not exist aside from this ministry. As the descendents of the apostles, the

position of bishops was very important. The bishop was the embodiment of all religious authority within his diocese, and Feild firmly believed in the high status and spiritual authority of the bishop within his church. He felt that those denominations that did not have episcopal government were not legitimate churches. The sacraments of Christianity dispensed by such ministers were not valid and cooperation with them was impossible. As well as being the true exponent of Christianity, the identity of the Church of England was historically unique. Its position was that of a *via media* between Protestantism and Catholicism, containing both within it and attending to either part of its heritage throughout the years whereas other episcopal churches had apostatized from their roots.

Feild perceived the Church of England to be a spiritual entity that was not subordinate to the secular government. He did not agree with Erastian understandings of the Church of England since the episcopal government of the church came from Christ, and did not depend on the state. Feild and his fellow Tractarians campaigned after 1832 ever more strongly for the autonomous governance of the Church of England, at a time when the English parliament was open to Catholics, dissenters, and atheists. Because of their High Church ecclesiology, Tractarians considered it necessary that the Church of England regain control over its own governance. Overseas, the situation was more complicated since ecclesiastical legislation passed in England regarding the Church of England did not necessarily apply to the church in Newfoundland and Bermuda, because these colonies had their own independent legislatures. This enabled Feild to ignore any legislation of which he disapproved, but only a return to Convocation would put an end to the secular state interfering with the affairs of the church.

Feild believed that the Church of England should be legally and financially

independent. The church in his diocese would only become independent of outside influences once it was financially self-supporting and no longer relying on money from outsiders. In order for this to occur, Feild put into practice a scheme of a centralized collection of funds by the Church Society. Opposition to this scheme by Evangelicals was due in part because the centralization would no longer enable them to punish or sanction financially individual parish priests of whom they disapproved. Controversy arose when the ordinances of the church were withheld from those who refused to pay the allotted fees to the Church Society. The situation in Bermuda was somewhat different from that of Newfoundland since Bermuda had a parish system and each priest received a small stipend from the colony. Since the stipends were not permanent, Feild wished the Church of England in Bermuda to become financially self-sufficient as well.

For complete independence in church matters, legislative and financial self-sufficiency was not enough for Feild. He believed that the Church of England needed also to have responsibility for the education of its children. In his mind, it was impossible to separate education and religion, and education of the youth of the church was considered a sacred duty of the clergy. Since the goal of education was to instil Christian truths, it was imperative that the Church of England teach its children the catechism. Feild fought for a subdivision of the legislative grant the Newfoundland government gave for education in order to ensure that Church of England children had an education that reflected the values of the church. He fought for this throughout his episcopate and saw the division occur in 1874, in the last years of his life.

The Church of England realized its position as the location of true Christianity through its public worship services. Worship was primarily for glorifying God, but it also

enlightened and informed the worshipper. Feild and the Oxford Movement recognized that the worship of their day had become unprofitable and meaningless and wished to increase the quality of worship and devotion in the Church of England. They did so by deemphasizing preaching and by paying increased attention to the sacraments. This elevated understanding of the sacraments led to liturgical reforms in the church. Feild sought to turn the church in his diocese away from local services that stressed the sermon as the central point in the worship service to more formal worship as set out in the *Book of Common Prayer*. For Feild, local custom was not vital, but the traditions and rubrics of the Church of England were.

Feild stressed tradition more than reason and the individual. Seeking unity and cohesion for his diocese, he felt it could be accomplished by turning to the established authorities of Christianity and the Church of England in order to gain an understanding of biblical and Christian truths. Feild did not discourage his people from reading the Bible, but he thought it necessary that such reading take into account the interpretative depth of Scripture. Since Newfoundland was so isolated, and the people of the colony had been neglected for much of its history, they lacked a fundamental grasp of the basics of Christianity, let alone those of the Church of England. While individual reason had some value, it was not to take the place of established authorities. The use of mere reason was also dangerous in Feild's eyes since it could lead to an excessive faith in human abilities, and away from a reliance on God and his church. The authorities turned to most often by the Oxford Movement were those of the early church, as the movement sought to restore the Church of England to its roots. Since the church fathers lived nearer the time of Christ, the Tractarians believed that their pronouncements, creeds, and councils

embodied Christianity's collective thought more authentically. Feild agreed with this, but placed also great stress on the English Reformers and their writings, as opposed to those Tractarians who were one-sidedly influenced by Froude and his critique of the Reformers as being too "Protestant."

Feild insisted on following strictly the rules and rubrics of the church so that there would be a set standard of worship within the diocese. Originally, the worship on Sunday mornings was divided into three distinct services- the Litany, Morning Prayer, and the service of communion. In the centuries since the institution of the *Book of Common Prayer*, the separate services had merged into one very lengthy public worship service. The *Book of Common Prayer* was the service book of the Church of England, and it was through returning to the public worship services of the church as laid out in that book that the worship of the Church of England also returned to its liturgical roots. Feild realized that many of the rubrics of the church had been forgotten, but that did not mean that they were no longer of any value. Although he and his fellow Tractarians were charged with introducing innovations in worship, they saw themselves instead returning to conformity with the rules and ordinances of the normative beginnings of the Church of England. Feild held that the rubrics of the *Book of Common Prayer* for the performance of the public and occasional church services required compliance because the outward aspects of worship could not be separated from its inward and spiritual dimension. He felt that every part of the worship service had significance and was deserving of reverence and attention. At the end of his episcopate, worship within his diocese had changed from an Evangelical emphasis on the sermon to the exclusion of all else to a more Catholic ethos that placed most stress on the sacraments of the church.

A sacrament was for Feild a visible sign of the grace of God and the means by which believers received that grace. As sign and means, Feild felt they were of immense significance. He instructed the clergy and laity of his diocese to recognize this and value them properly. The sacraments and their rightful administration were inextricably linked to salvation, and the presence of Christ in one's life. Feild understood baptism and the Eucharist to be the sacraments necessary for salvation, since they brought about the spiritual birth of the soul and provided its spiritual food. They were, however, not the only sacraments celebrated by the Church of England. Confirmation, confession, matrimony, ordination, and ministry to the sick were not borrowed from Roman Catholicism but represented traditional sacraments of the Church of England, and were to be valued as such.

The sacrament of baptism was significant to Feild because it brought about one's spiritual birth and welcomed the believer into the body of Christ. Baptism was a public sacrament and Feild understood that it needed to be administered in the church with as many of the congregation present as possible as witnesses. The sacrament infused the recipient with the grace of God and imparted righteousness to the individual. Consequently, Feild considered it necessary that the clergy pay due reverence to the sacrament and make sure to follow all the rubrics of the church regarding baptism; this included a font of stone and the provision of godparents. The sacrament of baptism as understood by Feild's Tractarianism was not without controversy, specifically his doctrine of baptismal regeneration. Feild used this term in connection with the sacrament since that was how the *Book of Common Prayer* had described it, but conflict arose since Evangelical members of the Church of England opposed such an understanding.

While baptism welcomed an individual into the communion of saints, membership in the Church of England was achieved through confirmation. It was through confirmation that the bishop of a diocese conferred the Holy Spirit on an individual by the laying on of hands. Confirmation was only possible by the bishop and the main purpose of Feild's voyages around his diocese was to perform this sacrament. Feild was only willing to confirm those who had knowledge of the tenets of Christianity and the dogmas of the Church of England. Since the fishery, the occupation of the majority of his flock, had an irregular nature, continual preparation was best suited for the people. Confirmation was the beginning of full life in the Church of England.

Feild did not believe that taking part in communion was an optional exercise, and, since it was necessary for one's spiritual health, it was to take place as often as possible, weekly if not more frequently. As a Tractarian, Feild realized that those receiving the Eucharist were participating in a most holy activity of overarching significance. Clergy and laity were to approach the sacrament with faith and repentance. All aspects of the administration of the sacrament were of importance, including the vessels used and the manner of its administration to the people. The body and blood of Christ was present in the bread and wine of the sacrament, although the precise nature of this presence was considered to be a holy mystery. Following the language of the *Book of Common Prayer*, Feild and his fellow Tractarians affirmed a "real presence" of Christ in the Eucharist. Before someone took communion, confession of sins was necessary. Feild realized that confession to God alone was not enough and private confession to a priest was sometimes necessary. Tractarians pointed out that auricular confession was a traditional Church of England practice, but objections arose from those who equated it with the Roman

Catholic sacrament of penance. Controversy also arose in Newfoundland over this practice, specifically in Harbour Buffett where Reverend William Kepple White followed the Tractarian sacramental understanding of Feild.

Alongside baptism and communion, Feild also considered matrimony a sacrament in the Church of England. God had ordained marriage; it glorified God and served as a demonstration of divine love. Feild felt that, as a religious practice, the sacrament needed to be administered in a uniform manner throughout his diocese, and with attention paid to its spiritual status. For all of those reasons, marriage was the proper province of the church, and the state had no place interfering with it. Civil marriage legislation was not appropriate, although it did occur as the state altered the marriage laws in the middle of the nineteenth century, making divorce easier to accomplish. Feild saw in this change a contradiction of the Scriptures and felt that it was not necessary for his priests to recognize such legislation. Disregard for the sacred nature of marriage went against Feild's Tractarian understanding of the sacrament and, in his various Charges to the clergy, he counselled them to instil a higher view of matrimony within their congregations.

Feild's Tractarian religious thought and his high understanding of the sacraments expressed itself also in the attention that he paid to the forms of worship. His heightened sacramentalism was responsible for the great care he took in the design and construction of church buildings within his diocese. Since the spiritual and the material were bound up together within Feild's thought, it was no surprise that, although he did not have architectural training, he considered architectural reform just as important as liturgical reform in order to bring about an increased level of spirituality in Newfoundland,

Labrador, and Bermuda. A church was a special place and needed to be designed in such a way that its unique purpose was evident. Since preaching had been downgraded in favour of the sacraments, church design had to follow suit. The few churches that Feild found upon arrival in his diocese were not suitable for Christian worship as he saw it since they had a centrally located pulpit and ignored the altar. During his episcopate, Feild was a champion for the construction of new churches and the renovation of existing ones. He was concerned with all details of design, construction, and furnishing, because even the minutest detail enhanced the worship experience.

The religious ideals and reforms to the Church of England introduced by the Oxford Movement found concrete expression through the publications of the Cambridge Camden Society and its ideas regarding church building and renovation. As with the Tractarians, adherents of the Cambridge Movement also looked to the past to gain their understanding of a more Catholic form of church architecture, more specifically medieval Gothic architecture. The Gothic style came into existence during a time of reverence towards God that was felt lacking in the contemporary church, and the reintroduction of Gothic would help to renew a sense of awe among the laity. Although Feild was not himself a member of the society, he was familiar with its ideals through his close friendship with William Scott, who was very active in the society. He wrote Scott for advice on ecclesiological matters and sent the original plans of St. John's Cathedral to the Cambridge Camden Society for their evaluation.

A church was not a church until it was set apart for the glory of God through the service of consecration. In his office as bishop, Feild performed numerous consecrations of churches, communion vessels, and graveyards in his diocese. Although the

consecration service did not materially alter the objects, buildings, or land, their sacralisation set them apart from common use. Their character had changed for members of the Church of England. Once a building was consecrated a church, it was restricted to that particular communion; the building was not open to ministers of other denominations. Feild understood consecration as being necessarily limiting and opposed cooperation, no matter what the previous local custom might have been.

Feild firmly believed in the tenets of the Cambridge Camden Society regarding church design and construction, but he ran into difficulties since there were few in Newfoundland who had knowledge of the society's publications. Luckily, he was able to draw upon the skill of William Grey, who was able to adapt the ecclesiological principles of the society to local materials and conditions. In order to shift emphasis from pulpit to altar, it was not always necessary to completely rebuild existing churches. With the addition of a chancel, housing the altar, the size of a church was enlarged and focus put upon the administration of the sacraments. The greatest expression of Feild's understanding of the correct design and furnishing of a church was the Cathedral of St. John the Baptist in St. John's. A cathedral was the seat of a bishop, and Feild's cathedral needed to conform as closely as possible to his religious ideals in order to reflect his episcopal office and his sacramental understanding of Church of England worship. The cathedral was an imposing example of Gothic revival architecture, designed by Sir George Gilbert Scott, both a leading church architect and a Tractarian. It was designed in a cruciform shape, and, although unfinished at that time, the nave was consecrated as a cathedral in 1850.

Not only was the external design of a church important to Feild, but internal design and furnishing were as well. Feild fought against the traditional inclusion of galleries and rented pews, as did members of the Cambridge Movement, since these features lessened the reverence due to the sacraments by cramping the church interior and decreasing the accommodation available. By the end of his episcopate, the churches within his diocese were geared to a correct administration of the sacraments by focussing attention upon the altar and the font. The altar was within the chancel, placed at the eastern end of the church, and the font of stone was at the western, or main, entrance. A church had a unique function and its form, ornamentation, and ritual were all illustrations of, and serving, its sacred purpose. In all of these and in his Tractarian sacramentalism, Feild felt that he had not innovated but merely returned to the rubrics of the *Book of Common Prayer*.

Edward Feild was bishop of Newfoundland from 1844 to 1876, years of great change in the Church of England, in the colony, and in the wider world. Everything that he accomplished, or attempted to accomplish, during his life, had a religious motivation. He was not simply a High Churchman but a Tractarian in his thought and his actions. Not only was he Tractarian in thought, but also his actions convey his familiarity with the manner in which the Cambridge Movement brought Tractarian ideals to concrete expression. The clearest expression of Feild's thought can be found in his Charges to the clergy of Newfoundland and Bermuda. It was in them that Feild demonstrated his sacramentalism and the Tractarian nature of his thought and activities. Feild's Tractarianism paid little attention to local custom or conditions, and was firmly established before he arrived in his diocese. Before Feild, the diocese of Newfoundland,

including the Archdeaconry of Bermuda, was evangelical in character, decentralized and favoured preaching above all else in worship. At the end of his episcopate, the numbers of clergy had significantly increased and were Tractarian in character. In addition, the number of churches in his centrally governed diocese, most of which followed the architectural ideals of the Cambridge Camden Society, had considerably risen.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Edward Feild: Manuscripts

Feild. Diary. April-August 1844. McCord Museum. Montréal.

Feild-William Hay Correspondence. Religion in Newfoundland and Labrador Collection. Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Feild-G. Gilbert Scott Correspondence. Religion in Newfoundland and Labrador Collection. Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Feild-William Scott Correspondence. Religion in Newfoundland and Labrador Collection. Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Feild. Manuscript Sermons. Religion in Newfoundland and Labrador Collection. Memorial University of Newfoundland

Edward Feild: Publications

An Address on the State of the Country to the Inhabitants of Kidlington, in the Parish School-room, November 28, 1830. 2nd ed. Oxford: W. Baxter, 1830.

Machine-breaking, and the Changes Occasioned by it in the Village of Turvey Down: A Tale of the Times, November 30, 1830. Oxford: W. Baxter, 1830.

Effects of Drunkenness Shewn in an Address Read to his Parishioners, June 19, 1831. Oxford: W. Baxter, 1831.

Help to the Knowledge and Practice of Psalmody for the Use of Schools: Part 1. Oxford: W. Baxter, 1831.

Report on the State of Parochial Education in the Diocese of Salisbury. 2nd ed. London: James Burns, 1841.

Report on the State of Parochial Education in the Diocese of Worcester. London: Levey, Robson and Franklyn, 1841.

Order and Uniformity in the Public Services of the Church, According to the Use of the United Church of England and Ireland: the Substance of a Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland by Edward Feild, D.D., Bishop of

Newfoundland, at his First Visitation, on the Feast of St. Matthew, September 21, 1844. St. John's: John W. McCoubrey, 1844.

List of Contributions to the Funds for Ecclesiastical Purposes in the Diocese of Newfoundland, with the Letter of the Bishop to the Contributors. London: R. Clay, 1845.

A Journal of the Bishop's Visitation of the Missions on the Western and Southern Coast, August and September, 1845, with an Account of the Anniversary Meeting of the Church Society held October 15, 1845. Church in the Colonies, no. 10. London: The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1846.

God Glorified in His Saints. A Sermon Preached in St. John's Church, Bermuda, on the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, 1846. Hamilton, Bermuda: Donald M'Phee, 1846.

The Apostle's Hope and Great Plainness of Speech. A Sermon Preached in St. John's Church, Bermuda, on St. Mathias's Day, 1846. Hamilton, Bermuda: Donald M'Phee, 1846.

A Journal of the Bishop's Visitation of the Missions of the Northern Coast in the Summer of 1846. Church in the Colonies, no. 15. London: The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1846.

A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Newfoundland by the Bishop, at his Second Visitation, on the Feast of St. Matthew, September 21, 1847. Bermuda, n. p., 1849.

A Visit to Labrador in the Autumn of 1848 by the Lord Bishop of Newfoundland; with a Prefatory Letter by the Lord Bishop of London, and a Map. Church in the Colonies, no. 19. London: The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1849.

A Journal of the Bishop of Newfoundland's Voyage of Visitation and Discovery, on the South and West Coasts of Newfoundland and on the Labrador, in the Church Ship "Hawk," in the Year 1848. Church in the Colonies, no. 21. London: The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1849.

A Plea for Reverent Behaviour in the House of God. A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of St. David's Chapel, Bermuda, on April 11th 1849. Hamilton, Bermuda: Donald M'Phee, 1849.

A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda on the Tuesday in Easter Week, 1849. St. John's: John W. McCoubrey, 1850.

A Journal of a Voyage of Visitation in the "Hawk" Church Ship on the Coast of Labrador, and Round the Whole Island of Newfoundland, in the year 1849.

Church in the Colonies, no. 25. London: The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1850.

The Church of the Holy Apostles. A Sermon Preached at the Consecration of Christ Church, in the Parish of Devonshire, Bermuda: on the Feast of the Annunciation, 1851. Hamilton, Bermuda: Donald M'Phee, 1851.

The Form of Prayer and Ceremonies to be Used on Christmas Day, at the Consecration of the Vessels and Books Presented to the Cathedral Church of St. John the Baptist, 20 December 1851. St. John's: J. C. Withers, 1851.

Remarks on the Sub-division of the Legislative Grant for the Encouragement of Education in this Colony. St. John's, n. p., 1852.

An Address to the Congregation of St. Thomas's Church by the Bishop of Newfoundland. St. John's: J. C. Withers, 1853.

A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda by the Bishop of Newfoundland at his Visitation, on St. Mark's Day 1853. Halifax: William Gossip, 1853.

A Journal of the Bishop of Newfoundland's Voyage of Visitation on the Coast of Labrador and the North-east Coast of Newfoundland in the Church Ship, "Hawk," in the Year 1853. Church in the Colonies, no. 30. London: Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1854.

An Address on the System of the Church Society in Newfoundland Submitted to the Members of the Church of England. St. John's: J. C. Withers, 1854.

A Letter to the Committee of the Newfoundland Church Society by the Bishop, October 30, 1857. St. John's: John T. Burton, 1857.

A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland on St. John Baptist's Day, M.DCCC.LVIII. St. John's: John T. Burton, 1858.

An Address Delivered at the Consecration of the Mortuary Chapel in the St. John's Cemetery, on the 31st day of December, 1859. St. John's: John T. Burton, 1860.

Extracts From a Journal of a Voyage of Visitation in the "Hawk," 1859. Church in the Colonies, no. 37. London: The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1860.

A Plea for Colonial Dioceses: in Reply to Strictures on the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. St. John's: John T. Burton, 1865.

The Dangers of Men's Wisdom and Knowledge: a Sermon, Preached on Board the Great Eastern, in her Passage from Newfoundland to England, after Laying the Atlantic

Telegraph Cable of 1866, and Recovering and Completing that of 1865. London: Metchim and Son, 1866.

A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Bermuda by Edward Feild, D.D., Bishop of Newfoundland, on Tuesday, in Easter week, 1866. Halifax: J. Bowes and Sons, 1866.

A Charge Delivered to the Clergy of Newfoundland, June 25, 1866, and Printed at Their Request. London: Rivington, 1867.

A Short Catechism on Confirmation, or Laying on of Hands. S.P.C.K. Tract 1669. London: Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 1870.

The Means and Methods of a Christian's Life, as Told and Taught by the Form and Arrangements of a Christian Church: a Sermon preached in Trinity Church, Hamilton, Bermuda, on St. Mark's Day, 1870. London: W. Clinkskel, 1870.

Other Primary Sources

Collett, Thomas Edwards. *The Church of England in Newfoundland, No. 2: Containing a Statement and Reply of Thomas E. Collett, Esq., J.P., a Brief Review of Proceedings Connected with the Clergy and Church in this Diocese during the Past Few Years, and Observations and Additional Evidence in Confirmation of the Former Statements, and in Refutation of the Attacks upon Them.* St. John's: Joseph Woods, 1854.

Davies, Richard. *A Sermon Preached in the Chapel of Lambeth Palace, at the Consecration of the Right Rev. Edward, Lord Bishop of Newfoundland, on Sunday, April 28, 1844.* London: Rivington, 1844.

The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI. 1910. Reprint, with an introduction by E. C. S. Gibson. London: J. M. Dent, 1960.

Froude, Richard Hurrell. *The Remains of the Late Reverend Richard Hurrell Froude.* Edited by John Henry Newman and John Keble. London: Rivington, 1838.

Gladstone, William Ewart. "Ritual and Ritualism." *Contemporary Review* 24 (1874): 663-81.

Grey, William. "The Ecclesiology of Newfoundland." *The Ecclesiologist* 14 (1853): 156-161.

"In Memoriam, Edward Feild, D. D., Bishop of Newfoundland, 1844-1876." *The Guardian,* June 21, 1876.

Kelly, James. *Memorial to the Late Bishop Feild.* N. p., 1876.

Liddon, Henry Parry. *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey: Doctor of Divinity, Canon of Christ Church; Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford.* Edited by J. O. Johnston and Robert J. Wilson. 4th ed. 4 vols. London: Longmans, Green, 1894-98.

Mozley, Thomas. *Reminiscences Chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement.* 2 vols. 1882. Reprint, Farnborough, England: Gregg, 1969.

Newman, John Henry. *Parochial and Plain Sermons.* Vol. IV. London: Longmans, Green, 1987.

_____. *Apologia Pro Vita Sua.* Edited by David DeLaura. New York: Norton, 1968.

_____. *The Via Media of the Anglican Church.* Edited with introduction and notes by H. D. Weidner. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

_____. *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman.* Edited at the Birmingham Oratory with notes and an introduction by Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961-.

Prevost, George. *The Autobiography of Isaac Williams.* New York: Longmans, Green, 1892.

Report of the Cathedral Building Committee, with the Treasurer's Account, to 1st October, 1844. St. John's: Ryan and Withers, 1844.

Scott, William. "The Progress of Anglo-Catholicism." *Christian Remembrancer* 4, no. 19 (1842): 58-74.

_____. "The Episcopal Question." *Christian Remembrancer* 5, no. 27 (1843): 341-361.

_____. "Moral Effect of Ritual Irregularity." *Christian Remembrancer* 5, no. 28 (1843): 525-542.

_____. "The Newfoundland Mission." *Christian Remembrancer* 20, no. 70 (1850), 488-508.

Spencer, Aubrey George. *The Church of God: a Sermon on Acts XX, 28, Preached in the Parish Church of St. John's, Newfoundland, on Good Friday, 1842.* St. John's: John W. McCoubrey, 1842.

"Tracts for the Times." *Project Canterbury.* http://anglicanhistory.org/tracts/index.html (accessed 3 October 2006).

Tucker, Henry William. *Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of Edward Feild, D.D., Bishop of Newfoundland, 1844-1876.* London: W. W. Gardner, 1877.

Webster, Christopher, ed. *'Temples...Worthy of His Presence': The Early Publications of the Cambridge Camden Society.* London: Spire Books, 2003.

Secondary Literature

Unpublished Materials

Headon, Christopher Fergus. "The Influence of the Oxford Movement upon the Church of England in Eastern and Central Canada, 1840-1900." Ph.D. diss., McGill University, 1974.

Hollett, Calvin. "Resistance to Bishop Edward Feild in Newfoundland, 1845-1857, Harbour Buffett: A Case Study." M.A. thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 2002.

Jones, Frederick. "Bishop Feild, a Study in Politics and Religion in Nineteenth-Century Newfoundland." Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1971.

Leader, Patricia J. "The Hon. Reverend William Grey, MA." M.T.S. thesis, Queen's College, 1998.

Lear, Edward James. "Edward Feild (1801-1876), Ecclesiastic and Educator: His Influence on the Development of Denominational Education in Newfoundland." M.A. thesis, Bishop's University, 1986.

Russell, Heather Rose. "Evangelicalism in the Anglican Church in Nineteenth-Century Newfoundland." M.A. thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland, 2005.

Sheldon, Mary. "The Establishment of the Denominational School System in Newfoundland with Particular Reference to the Role of the Anglican Church 1836-1876." M.A. thesis, University of Toronto, 1972.

Printed Materials

Adelmann, Dale. *The Contribution of Cambridge Ecclesiologists to the Revival of Anglican Choral Worship 1839-62.* Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 1997.

Adelmann, Dale. Preface to *The Contribution of Cambridge Ecclesiologists to the Revival of Anglican Choral Worship 1839-62.* Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 1997.

Aubert, Roger. *Church History in Future Perspective.* New York: Herder and Herder, 1970.

Avis, Paul. *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Baker, William J. "Hurrell Froude and the Reformers." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 21, no. 3 (1970): 243-259.

_____. "Lloyd, Charles (1784-1829)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16822 (accessed 28 November 2006).

Battiscome, Georgina. *John Keble: A Study in Limitations.* London: Constable, 1963.

Bradley, James E., and Richard A. Muller. *Church History: an Introduction to Research, Reference Works, and Methods.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Brandwood, Geoffrey K. "'Fond of Church Architecture'- the Establishment of the Society and a Short History of its Membership." In *'A Church as it Should be': The Cambridge Camden Society and its Influence*, edited by Christopher Webster and John Elliot, 45-61. Stamford: Shaun Tyas, 2000.

Brendon, Piers. "Newman, Keble and Froude's *Remains.*" *The English Historical Review* 87, no. 345 (1972): 697-716.

_____. *Hurrell Froude and the Oxford Movement.* London: Elek, 1974.

_____. "Froude, (Richard) Hurrell (1803–1836)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/10203 (accessed 28 November 2006).

Brilioth, Yngve. *The Anglican Revival: Studies in the Oxford Movement.* New York: Longmans, Green, 1933.

Carrington, Philip. *The Anglican Church in Canada: A History.* Toronto: Collins, 1963.

Chadwick, Owen. Introduction to *The Mind of the Oxford Movement.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1960.

_____. *The Victorian Church.* Vol. 1, *Part One: 1829-1859.* 3rd ed. London: SCM Press, 1987.

_____. *The Victorian Church.* Vol. 2, *Part Two: 1860-1901.* 2nd ed. London: SCM Press, 1987.

_____. *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Chadwick, Owen, ed. *The Mind of the Oxford Movement*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1960.

"Christ Church (Quidi Vidi, St. John's)." *Newfoundland & Labrador's Registered Heritage Structures*. 2004. http://www.heritage.nf.ca/society/rhs/rs_listing/205.html (accessed 18 May 2007).

Church, R. W. *The Oxford Movement: Twelve years, 1833-1845*. 1891. Reprint, edited and with an introduction by Geoffrey Best, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Coleridge, John Taylor. *A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble, M.A., Late Vicar of Hursley*. 4th ed. Oxford: James Parker, 1874.

Crumb, Lawrence N. *The Oxford Movement and its Leaders: A Bibliography of Secondary and Lesser Primary Sources*. Metuchen, NJ: American Theological Library Association: Scarecrow Press, 1988.

Cunningham, Colin. *Stones of Witness: Church Architecture and Function*. Stroud, England: Sutton, 1999.

Curling, Joseph and Charles Knapp. *Historical Notes Concerning Queen's College, St. John's, Diocese of Newfoundland, 1842-1897*. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1898.

Earle, George Halden. "Mountain, Jacob George." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*, general editor Ramsey Cook. http://www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=38219&query=mountain (accessed 17 April 2007).

Edmonds, E. L. "School Inspection: The Contribution of Religious Denominations." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 7, no. 1 (1958): 12-26.

Faught, C. Brad. *The Oxford Movement: A Thematic History of the Tractarians and Their Times*. University Park, PA: State University Press, 2003.

Gibson, E. C. S. Introduction to *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*. 1910. Reprint, London: J. M. Dent, 1960.

Greene, John Carrick. *Between Damnation and Starvation: Priests and Merchants in Newfoundland Politics, 1745-1855*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.

Gunn, Gertrude E. *The Political History of Newfoundland, 1832-1864*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.

Handy, Robert T. *A History of the Churches in the United States and Canada.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

Headon, Christopher Fergus. "Developments in Canadian Anglican Worship in Eastern and Central Canada, 1840-1868." *Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society* 17 (June 1975): 26-37.

Hollett, Calvin. "Evangelicals versus Tractarians. Resistance to Bishop Feild at Harbour Buffett, Placentia Bay, 1849-1854." *Newfoundland Studies* 18, no. 2 (2002): 245-278.

_____. "Bishop Edward Feild: A Wedge in Newfoundland Society." *Newfoundland Quarterly* 98, no. 3 (2006): 34-40.

House, Edgar. *Edward Feild: The Man and His Legacy.* St. John's: Jesperson, 1987.

Huelin, Gordon. "A Tractarian Clergyman and His Friends." *Church Quarterly Review* 160, no. 334 (1959): 37-48.

Hylson-Smith, Kenneth. *Evangelicals in the Church of England, 1734-1984.* Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1989.

_____. *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth Century to the Late Twentieth Century.* Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1993.

Jones, Frederick. "Religion, Education and Politics in Newfoundland, 1836-1875." *Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society* 12, no. 4 (1970): 64-76.

_____. "Newfoundland and Canada in the 1860s." *History Today* 22, no. 6 (1972): 420-425.

_____. "The Making of a Colonial Bishop: Feild of Newfoundland." *Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society* 15, no. 1 (1973): 2-13.

_____. "Early Opposition to Bishop Feild in Newfoundland." *Journal of the Canadian Church Historical Society* 16, no. 2 (1974): 30-41.

_____. "Bishops in Politics: Roman Catholic versus Protestant in Newfoundland 1860-2." *Canadian Historical Review* 55, no. 4 (1974): 408-421.

_____. "John Bull's Other Ireland – Nineteenth-Century Newfoundland." *Dalhousie Review* 55, no. 2 (1975): 227-235.

_____. *Edward Feild, Bishop of Newfoundland, 1844-1876.* Newfoundland Historical Society Pamphlet 4. St. John's: Newfoundland Historical Society, 1976.

_____. "Edward Feild, Inspector of Schools, 1840-41." *Journal of Educational Administration and History* 9, no. 2 (1977): 8-13.

_____. "The Church in Nineteenth-Century Newfoundland." *Bulletin of Canadian Studies* 5, no. 1 (1981): 25-40.

_____. "The Great Fire of 1846 and the Coming of Responsible Government to Newfoundland." *Bulletin of Canadian Studies* 6-7, no. 2-1 (1983): 61-69.

_____. "Feild, Edward (1801–1876)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/9247 (accessed July 24, 2006).

_____. "Grey, William." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online,* general editor Ramsey Cook. http://www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=39132&query=william%20AND%20grey (accessed 24 July 2006).

Kalman, Harold. *A Concise History of Canadian Architecture.* Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Kearley, E. Rex. *Queen's College, 1841-1991.* St. John's: Jesperson, 1991.

Livingston, James C. *Modern Christian Thought.* Vol. 1, *The Enlightenment and the Nineteenth Century.* 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997.

Lohse, Bernhard. *A Short History of Christian Doctrine.* Translated by F. Ernest Stoeffler. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

McCann, Phillip. "The Politics of Denominational Education in the Nineteenth Century in Newfoundland." In *The Vexed Question: Denominational Education in a Secular Age*, edited by William A. McKim, 30-59. St. John's: Breakwater, 1988.

Meaden, John Alfred. *More Historical Notes.* St. John's, 1979.

Millman, Thomas R. *Atlantic Canada to 1900: A History of the Anglican Church.* Toronto: Anglican Book Centre, 1983.

Mockridge, Charles Henry. *The Bishops of the Church of England in Canada and Newfoundland: Being an Illustrated Historical Sketch of the Church of England in Canada, as Traced Through Her Episcopate.* Toronto: F. N. W. Brown, 1896.

Moorman, John. *A History of the Church in England.* 3rd ed. London: A. and C. Black, 1976.

Newsome, David. *The Parting of Friends: The Wilberforces and Henry Manning*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993.

Nockles, Peter Benedict. *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Norgate, G. Le G. "Scott, William (1813–1872)." Rev. N. W. James. In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24937 (accessed 17 April 2007).

O'Connell, Marvin R. *Oxford Conspirators: A History of the Oxford Movement 1833-45*. New York: Macmillan, 1969.

O'Flaherty, Patrick. *Lost Country: The Rise and Fall of Newfoundland, 1843-1933*. St. John's: Long Beach, 2005.

Patterson, Robert S., John W. Chalmers, and John W. Friesen. *Profiles of Canadian Educators*. Toronto: D.C. Health Canada, 1974.

Prowse, Daniel Woodley. *A History of Newfoundland*. 1895. Reprint, with a forward by Leslie Harris. Portugal Cove, NL: Boundler Publications, 2002.

Reed, John Shelton. *Glorious Battle: The Cultural Politics of Victorian Anglo-Catholicism*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1996.

Rollmann, Hans. "John Hoskins of Old Perlican, Trinity Bay." *Early Methodism in Newfoundland*. http://www.mun.ca/rels/meth/texts/origins/earlym8.html (accessed 15 May 2007).

_____. "Lowell, Robert Traill Spence." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*, general editor Ramsey Cook. http://www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=40364&query=lowell (accessed 2 October 2006).

Rose, Elliot. "The Stone Table in the Round Church and the Crisis of the Cambridge Camden Society." *Victorian Studies* 10, no. 2 (1966): 119-144.

Rowell, Geoffrey. *The Vision Glorious: Themes and Personalities of the Catholic Revival in Anglicanism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Rowlands, John Henry Lewis. *Church, State, and Society: The Attitudes of John Keble, Richard Hurrell Froude, and John Henry Newman, 1827-1845*. Worthing, England: Churchman, 1989.

Rowley, Owsley Robert. *The Anglican Episcopate of Canada and Newfoundland.* Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1928.

Senior, Elinor. "Feild, Edward." In *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*, general editor Ramsey Cook. http://www.biographi.ca/EN/ShowBio.asp?BioId=39101&query=field (accessed 24 July 2006).

Stamp, Gavin. "Scott, Sir George Gilbert (1811–1878)." In *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24869 (accessed 18 April 2007).

Thompson, Henry Paget. *Into All Lands: The History of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701-1950.* London: SPCK, 1951.

Vaiss, Paul, ed. *From Oxford to the People: Reconsidering Newman and the Oxford Movement.* Leominster, England: Gracewing, 1996.

Ward, Wilfrid Philip. *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement.* 1889. Reprint, Harnborough, England: Gregg International, 1969.

Webster, Christopher. "Postscript." In *'A Church as it Should be': The Cambridge Camden Society and its Influence,* edited by Christopher Webster and John Elliot, 348-358. Stamford: Shaun Tyas, 2000.

Webster, Christopher, ed. Introduction to *'Temples...Worthy of His Presence': The Early Publications of the Cambridge Camden Society.* London: Spire Books, 2003.

Webster, Christopher, and John Elliot, eds. *'A Church as it Should be': The Cambridge Camden Society and its Influence.* Stamford: Shaun Tyas, 2000.

Weidner, H. D., Preface to *The Via Media of the Anglican Church,* by John Henry Newman. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990

Welch, Allen Howard. "The Newfoundland Church-ship 'Hawk.'" *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 41 (June 1972): 117-136.

White, James F. *The Cambridge Movement: The Ecclesiologists and the Gothic Revival.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962.

Wilkinson, Henry C. *Bermuda from Sail to Steam: The History of the Island from 1784 to 1901.* 2 vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Wood, Edward Frederick Lindley, Earl of Halifax. *John Keble.* New ed. Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1932.

Yates, Nigel. *Buildings, Faith, and Worship: The Liturgical Arrangement of Anglican Churches, 1600-1900*. Rev. ed. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2000.

THE ECCLESIOLOGY OF NEWFOUNDLAND.

[We have much pleasure in publishing the following interesting letter, for which we are indebted to the Secretary of the Oxford Architectural Society.—Ed.]

To the Secretary of the Oxford Architectural Society.

Portugal Cove, near S. John's, Newfoundland,
Jan. 13th, 1853.

Sir,—It is now more than four years and a half ago that, on the occasion of my last visit to Oxford, I offered to resign my office of Corresponding Secretary of the Oxford Architectural Society (for Wiltshire), but my resignation was met with a request on the part of the then Committee that I would continue to hold the same office in the Colonies. I could not refuse the honour of being the first-appointed Colonial Secretary of a Society which I had always wished to serve to the best of my ability, and consequently acceded to the request. Yet I feel to my shame that my post has been too much of a sinecure (i. e., as regards the Society), and I must do and say something to retrieve my character,—although, as to *doing*, I will give myself so much credit as to say that I think that I have done something in trying to spread the knowledge of the principles of Gothic architecture, which is a working with that Society of which I am an unworthy member. But, to proceed with my report, I wish to say a few words upon the present state and future prospects of church-building in the Diocese of Newfoundland.

1. *As to its present state.*—Here you must first know that we are in some respects perhaps even two centuries or so behind the mother country,—in all respects, at least a quarter of a century. Fashions are palmed off on the credulous fashion-hunters here as new which really are stale enough in England. Church-building is in the same predicament; the revival, which began with you in 1839, can scarcely be said to have begun here, although there have certainly been more inquiries what Gothic architecture is within the last two years than ever there were before in Newfoundland. You wonder perhaps that, under these circumstances, Newfoundland can boast of our noblest colonial cathedral. But this is the doing of our noble-hearted Bishop alone. The building is quite unappreciated by the majority of persons here,—even by persons generally well-informed in other matters; they see no beauty in it, because it is not finished.

All buildings of any sort in this colony, with very few exceptions, have been of wood; until after the fire of 1846 the buildings in the lower part of S. John's, and all edifices for public purposes, were obliged by an act of the Colonial Legislation to be of stone. The wood employed for these wooden buildings is for the most part the produce of the country, which never grows to any great size. A house or

church is usually constructed in this way:—Sills are laid down consisting of chopped sticks, about eight inches at the small end, which, when chopped square, brings them about eight inches cube throughout; they are levelled, and kept there by shores driven well down in the ground. Afterwards, when the house or church is finished, if its builders wish it to look well, they build up a dry wall under these sills. The sills being laid down, they have mortice-holes cut in them, in which upright posts are set with tenons,—the posts being the required height of the walls, and having their outside face chopped fair (you must know that their hatchets are everything to Newfoundlanders); the posts are then lined on the top and sawn off straight, the wall-plate nailed on, the roof of chopped sticks put up, the different parts of it being merely nailed on to one another, and never morticed in, only each stick is let about an inch into the side of the other; then the walls, or rather the frames of the walls, are covered externally with clap-board, internally with inch lumber; sometimes the sticks are overlaid with the rough three-quarter or inch board sawn by the people here, and clap-board over that. The roof is then boarded over the rafters with the best board they can get, and then all the neighbours are called in to shingle it; sometimes sawn shingles are used, but more commonly cloven. In the case of a church, a ceiling under the tie beams, or at least under the collar, is thought the proper thing, and the lining of the walls inside to be painted one dumb of stone colour, which, being unbroken by anything like a string course, and often even by a cornice, is very painful to the eye. The windows are mostly of a genuine meeting-house type, and indeed all other furniture and details are not worthy of remark. High pews and galleries are seen in several of the older churches, though our good Bishop wages war against them. I ought to add, for his sake, that he has been instrumental in very many cases in replacing the old paltry church furniture with other of a more suitable character, of which the church here is a remarkable example. The details are for the most part incorrect, but still of good materials and well meant.

The sort of building I have described above is termed a "frame-house," which is considered the strongest sort of wooden house which can be built. There are also "stud-houses" and "plank-houses," neither of which I shall describe particularly, as they are reckoned unfit for churches. "Stud-wood" is used only for small and mean buildings, and is of a very primitive description: a number of studs (i. e., sticks from four to six inches thick) are set upright on a sill as close together as possible, and the interstices filled up with moss. Plank-houses are made of 3-inch plank, and, having no strong frame, are weaker than frame-houses, but the floors and partitions tie them together sufficiently.

As to stone buildings, it is only in S. John's that any number of them are to be seen, where, as I said above, people are obliged to turn their attention to the subject. I hear a good many complaints of the expensiveness of stone buildings; it seems that they want constant and costly repairs, owing to the ravages made on the cement by the intense frost, and the sudden changes to rapid thaw, which we have

Grey, William. "The Ecclesiology of Newfoundland." *The Ecclesiologist* 14 (1853): 156-161.

more or less every winter. All sorts of remedies are proposed and tried,—some paint their brickwork, others point with Roman cement. I have an idea myself that roughcast would be effectual, but I do not think I have seen it tried. I should be glad of any hint on this subject, especially from any of our members who may have extended their vacation rambles to such countries as Norway, Sweden, or the north of Russia. Stone churches are built even in Iceland: what cement is used there?

Of stone churches built before the fire of 1846, I know but two,—that of Harbour Grace, and the large Romish chapel (so-called cathedral) in S. John's. The former I have not seen, but I am told that its state is bad enough. The latter I know is far from being in a safe condition. The Cathedral (not the Romish) has taken a good deal of pointing since its erection, but I think it promises pretty well; it is entirely pointed with Roman cement. I heard a great deal on my arrival about the frost splitting the stones in the wall, which I could not quite believe, and, on examining the walls, I found that the fractures in question were nothing more or less than settlements, caused by using too large stones and too fine joints. There are no other stone churches in the diocese besides what I have mentioned.

With this report I hope to send a few sketches to show you what some of our existing churches are. Very little need be said about them,—a sketch will tell you best, and "ex uno disce omnes." The only exception which occurs to me is Pouch Cove church, which is a great attempt at something correct, and in many respects is very pleasing; the great fault, perhaps, is that the walls are much too high. In this case, however, "too many cooks spoiled the broth," and what made it worse was, that none of the cooks knew exactly how the broth was to be mixed; several persons gave their advice about it, but none had a clear notion what Gothic architecture was.

2. To go on, then, with the *future* prospects of church-building here. The Cathedral I hope our eyes will see finished, but if that be not the case, I should think that the next generation would take care that the rest of the building should be only a carrying out of the original design of Mr. G. G. Scott, the architect. But as to other churches which may have to be built hereafter, we must look in the main to the Clergy to be the architects. I see no prospect at present of any really good church architect coming out here; and we want a person *on the spot* to design our wooden churches,—one who is thoroughly acquainted with the wants and resources of the country; it is little use to send home for designs to persons who do not know our manner of building, or the climate of Newfoundland. The churches of Norway were recommended to us some time ago as models; they do indeed give good hints, but it seems to me that such churches could not be put up here out of the material of the country; we have no such timber as that of Norway. In this place we have to go four or five miles to find sticks 11 feet long by six inches at the small end. Again, there is a good deal of woodwork in many parts of England—wooden pillars and arches, towers, porches, and even walls, in Cheshire, Hampshire, Sussex, and Essex; but there thick and crooked oak timber is used, and our sticks are thin and straight: so that altogether we want a *local* architect. But it seems as though S. John's would scarcely find employment for a really good one; there are builders and carpenters,—those who call themselves architects, and who are competent enough to do the principal work,—to run up square brick houses and design shop-fronts. One of these turned out an Independent meeting-house lately,—a sort of parody of Gothic, with bits cribbed from the Cathedral stuck in here and there, and a good honest square chimney crowning the eastern gable. I fear that I am partly to blame for this, for on the Archdeacon demanding of the "architect" his authority, he produced the elevations of Littlemore, published by our Society some years ago, which, I think, I gave away to somebody in S. John's. All the faults of Littlemore had been diligently copied, and its merits struck out. Here, then, the Clergy *must* be architects, and I see the necessity of their being so more and more every year. I found the necessity in England, but much more in the Colonies.

Let me add my voice to those of many others who have spoken before me, and strongly advise the junior members of our University to qualify themselves for Holy Orders by a practical knowledge of architecture. It is no disgrace to follow such men as William of Wykeham.

I must beg the Society not to accuse me too hastily of egotism, if I say a few words about their humble servant and his works. I have had the office of Diocesan Architect forced upon me, and in that capacity have given designs for eight entire churches, and for additions to two existing churches. However, one of the eight above mentioned (it is in Cape Breton Island, in the Diocese of Nova Scotia) was entirely remodelled, and a new chancel added according to my designs. Two others were in Labrador. When holding the office of Principal of Queen's College at S. John's, I used to give Architectural Lectures to the students twice a-week, as also a course of lectures on the same subject to the Clergy assembled at the Bishop's last visitation. I hope that the attention of the Clergy was called to the subject; it was perhaps only my vanity which made me suppose that the fact of a greatly increased demand for architectural works afterwards was caused by the effect of these same lectures of mine. I hope with this to send a few sketches of some of the churches which have been erected under my superintendence, and leave the Society to form their own opinion about them, asking them to remember that the sudden changes from frost to thaw, the high winds with furious snow-drifts, together with the poor materials, render a very simple outline quite necessary. A Newfoundland architect cannot produce all the varieties which battlements, parapets, pinnacles, gabled aisles, flat roofs, &c., &c., give to your English churches, without making his building either ludicrous, or dangerous, or both together.

I must speak no more of agents, but go on to the head of matter, and say a few words about our materials; how we may hope to handle them.

I am not at all certain (notwithstanding what I have said above, and what others have said,) that the walls of our churches may not be built

very wall of stone, either entirely or in part. (α) Entirely, by using (i.) either Cyclopean masonry, which might be done along the south coast of the island where granite is the prevailing rock. In this case no cement would be used outside, only the stones must be pretty well squared, and the walls being plastered inside, the air could not penetrate through the wall: (ii.) Or by giving the walls a good coat of rough-cast, always remembering to use small stones with wide joints, (like Roman masonry,) which will give a better hold to the rough-cast, as well as tend to make the settlements of the wall less ruinous in their consequences than where large stones and fine joints are used. (β) Or our walls might be built partly of stone, partly of wood; thus in the case of towers the lower part might be of stone, and the upper stage of wood, as is the case of many churches in Sussex and Hants, e.g. Westhampnet near Chichester. Or in the case of lower walls, they might be built in "black and white," as the Cheshire phrase is—a sort of work often seen even in large houses in that county, and very generally between Gloucester and Bristol, which consists of a wooden frame filled in with brick or stone; the stone or brick whitewashed, and the wooden frame painted black, or, what looks better, red. This sort of work, I think, might be employed in some districts hereabouts. On Bell Isle, in my parish, is found a sort of schist rock, which breaks to a smooth face, and often as square as a brick. The stones would lie together so close in a wall as scarcely to require any pointing or cement:—I have seen houses built in this fashion in Cornwall (in the neighbourhood of Liskeard I particularly remember them,) which had no sort of cement or mortar outside. And the window and door jambs being of timber, as also the quoins and other dressings, no dressed stones would be needed in such buildings, and the services of the stone-cutter dispensed with. I cannot help thinking that we shall be obliged to make more use of stone for churches and houses than is now done, as proper sticks for building are getting very scarce in the neighbourhood of S. John's, and round Conception Bay, owing partly to fires among the woods in summer, which fires extend often for five or six miles in length, and partly to the wasteful way the people hereabouts have of cutting and destroying the trees; barking many while still standing for the sake of the rind, and felling the trees in winter two feet or so above the root, they being buried in snow so deep or deeper, while they hack about the smaller trees to get boughs for the covering of their fish flakes.

As to buildings entirely of wood, we may make them much more ornamental than they generally are now. At present the ultima Thule of elegance in a wooden house, is to have the clap board nicely planed and painted white, and the frames of the doors and windows painted umber. But if the clap board be nailed on, some horizontally, some obliquely, with the frame-work painted with red and the clap board with yellow ochre, the building will have a much more pleasing appearance, with a very small extra expense—I ought rather to say less expense. The Parsonage here has been clap-boarded thus. It occurs to me that many Members of the Society do not understand what "clap board" means; I did not before I came out here. A straight stick is sawn down in such a way that each board shows a wedge-like section. This board when planed, is nailed across the uprights of the frame in courses about four inches—the nail which secures the lower, i.e. the thick edge, goes through the thin edge of the board below.

The *roofs* of our churches here deserve a good deal of thought and attention, for there are few places where a real good American timber roof can be erected; the native "sticks" must furnish all building materials in several out-harbours. But even with these we may have good ecclesiastical-looking roofs—e.g. such as those figured in plates 171, 175, of the 2nd Vol. of the "Glossary of Architecture," (5th edition) which are such as can be constructed with our small, straight timber. If any Members of our Society have fallen in with such a roof with its original decorative painting, I should be glad for any hints on this head.

Glazing is another matter on which I have thought a good deal. There are no workmen at all in Newfoundland who can make lead sashes worth anything. Zinc sashes have been used in several churches and houses, but few persons understand the way to use it, and I have found that the casements cannot be made weather-tight. You must remember that snow and rain with us always comes with a heavy gale: it does not fall quietly as with you at home. I think that in many cases we must use wooden sashes; this is the sort of work which people here understand, and is quite weather-tight. Indeed it is rather expensive when the quarrels are as small as you have in churches at home; but although I would never recommend large square panes such as are used commonly in dwelling-houses; I think we might have something between the two panes about 6 or 7 inches across, and arranged diamond-wise.

On the subject of *heating* churches I should be glad of any suggestions. I think myself that the mode of heating hot-houses would be the best in this climate. The hot air from a furnace below the level of the floor is carried by a pipe of drain tiles along the church, and discharges itself by a pipe or flue up a corner of the tower.

I am almost ashamed to trouble you with this long story, but perhaps as a report from Newfoundland is a novelty to the Society, I shall be excused. I shall be truly thankful for hints and suggestions on the subjects I have mentioned. Permit me also to draw the attention of Members to a statement which I hope to send by the same mail which takes this, concerning the new church which I am endeavouring to erect here. I presume that as the Society did not grant money to new churches when I was resident at Oxford, so it does not at present; but that the Committee will kindly recommend my case to the Members. I have only space to add that I am

Your obedient servant,

WILLIAM GREY.