

synagogue a few years ago, said: "I have been told that a considerable number of children of our working classes who attend Board Schools are present in the classrooms at the time when instruction in the New Testament is being given, while non-Jewish prayers are being read, and non-Jewish hymns are sung. I was inclined to disbelieve this statement. But all doubt on the subject was dispelled when I read as follows in the report of examination in Scripture knowledge issued by the Board School in Baker Street, Stepney. It says: 'In the classes other than Standard I. the Jewish children are present when the New Testament lessons are given, and *no objections are raised by parents.*' Nay, more, I have heard on good authority that in a certain Board School in Bethnal Green the prize for religious knowledge—mind, Christian religious knowledge—was carried off by a Jewish pupil. What an outcry was raised throughout civilized Europe when young Mortara was taken from his parental home to be brought up in the Catholic religion! And here are Jewish parents who, without raising a finger, allow their children to be brought up in an alien faith."¹

The *Jewish Year Book* gives a long list of Jewish celebrities "who have been converted."²

The foregoing facts eloquently testify that Christianity has influenced Jews of the Reformed faith to a very large extent. Apart from the direct results achieved in the way of actual conversion, there is a great work, a *preparatio evangelii*, going on. Is it too much to hope and to pray that Jews, who to-day are saying of our Lord Jesus Christ, "Behold the man," may cease to find satisfaction in admiring His sinless human nature, and be led on to exclaim in adoration and worship, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world"; and, "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for Him; we will be glad and rejoice in His salvation"?

W. T. GIDNEY.

The Month.

EARLY in May the King's advisers found themselves face to face with the task of recommending clergy for one bishopric and two deaneries. The See of Oxford has many attractions, but the deaneries of Salisbury and Peterborough are two offices the distinction of which is no longer accompanied by satisfactory emoluments. The death of Bishop Stubbs drew out the fullest recognition of his great powers as a historian, but it also produced evidence of the widespread conviction that

¹ *Jewish Chronicle*, March 31, 1895.

² Issue for 1900-1901, p. 223.

a profound scholar is not always a really good Bishop. One of the most interesting notices of Bishop Stubbs was that signed "F. Y. P." in the *Manchester Guardian*. Under these initials we may recognise the person of Professor York Powell of Oxford. His account of Bishop Stubbs is reproduced in the *Church Times*, and this fact gives the more prominence to certain statements in the article. Thus, of the Bishop's work it is said: "Remarkable, too, is the Royal Commission Report on Ecclesiastical Appeals, which attests at once his immense erudition as a scholar and his exceeding skill as an advocate; but it is a piece of controversy, a weighty political plea and apology, and not an historical treatise at all." So also we are reminded that "Once only, when face to face with a foe that had at command equally skilled forces and a far better position, did he fail to make good his defence, for, though the Bishop's retreat was most skilfully covered, there is no doubt that Dr. Maitland's victory was signal. It must be admitted that the best advocate cannot always win with a bad case." It may be remembered that as long ago as 1884 Mr. J. T. Tomlinson charged the Bishop with (1) devising a "political plea" for clerical judges administering Canon Law and the abolition of a Privy Council, and (2) with the pretence that England was not as much under Papal jurisdiction and Roman Canon Law as the rest of Latin Christendom.

In the middle of May it was announced that the King had been pleased to appoint, as the successor of Bishop Stubbs, the Very Rev. Francis Paget, Dean of Christ Church. Public gossip had from the very first marked out Dr. Paget as the most probable successor to Dr. Stubbs, and that despite the manifest awkwardness of promoting a Dean to the Bishop's stall in his old cathedral. But Lord Salisbury has shown a complete disregard of precedent in the making of Bishops—as, for example, in the preferment of Suffragans, as well as of a Suffragan to be the Bishop of the diocese—and in this case there seemed no sufficient reason why the successful Dean should not make a successful Bishop. As a matter of fact, Dr. Paget was urged by members of his own family to cry, at least on this occasion, "Nolo episcopari." But his recent bereavement must have made a change of scene and work desirable, and he accepted the offer. The Bishop-Designate had a very distinguished undergraduate career at Christ Church; obtained in due course a Senior Studentship; had some short parochial experience as Vicar of Bromsgrove; has been examining chaplain to three Bishops; was Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology; and has been a judicious head of a great foundation. He has all the personal charm of his family, and the appointment was received with very general satisfaction.

There was nothing epoch-making about the May sessions of the two Convocations and their Lay Houses. Less time was wasted than in February, and most of the subjects handled were of some importance. It seems to be agreed that "the Bill, the whole Bill, and nothing but the Bill," will not serve as a cry for those who want to reach the first steps in securing autonomy for the Church. Accordingly, the original Convocations Bill has been lightened of its most contentious parts, and is to be introduced into the House of Lords as the Convocations of the Clergy Bill. It will only seek power for the Convocations to reform themselves and to hold joint sessions. All Churchmen are agreed as to the necessity for that reform, and the two Convocations would, if the Bill were passed, have a great opportunity before them. A really drastic resettlement of the constitution of the two Lower Houses, made in a democratic spirit, would rally all the clergy to their side, and help to procure the belief—

at present rarely discovered—that they might also frame some practicable and trustworthy scheme of lay representation. But would they rise to such an opportunity? On the whole, few people seem prepared to answer "Yes!" with any confidence. The Upper House of Canterbury Convocation adopted the series of resolutions on the supply and training of candidates for Holy Orders which had been before them. The discussion showed appreciation of the serious condition of the Church in this matter, but it cannot be said that the resolutions excite any hope of early improvement. The new Bishop of London made a thoughtful speech, in which he discussed, in the light of his Oxford experiences, the reasons why so few men offered themselves. They were, he suggested, non-realization of the objectiveness of the call, the unsettlement of men's minds, the attractions of the Indian Civil Service, the poverty of the clergy, and the lack of encouragement given at home and at school to men to come forward for ordination.

The action of the Canterbury House of Laymen is sometimes in curious contrast with that of the York House. A striking instance was furnished in their May sessions. Mr. T. Cheney Garfit asked the Canterbury House to carry the following resolution: "That this House deplores the cases which have occurred of young people being pressed to auricular confession, and respectfully requests His Grace the Archbishop, and the Bishops of the Province, to use all legitimate means in their power for discouraging a practice which is detrimental to character, and not in accordance with the system of the Church of England." The House replied by accepting the "previous question." The York House, on the other hand, affirmed its conviction that the present Book of Common Prayer should be maintained, and Sir William Worsley's amendment to permit the alternative use of the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. found no seconder.

The programme of the Brighton Church Congress in an almost complete form saw the light in the middle of May—an early date. It may be interesting to put some of the subjects on the programme side by side with corresponding subjects brought before the Congress held at Brighton in 1874:

1874.	1901.
Convocations of the Church of England.	Church Autonomy—how exercised by Established and non-Established Churches, and how it should be exercised in the Church of England, regard being had to the Restoration of the Church's Synods and the Convocations Bill of 1900.
Diocesan Synods.	Education: (1) Primary, (2) Secondary.
Education, Primary and Secondary.	The Support of the Clergy.
Church Finance.	The Assessment and Taxation of Clerical Incomes.
Home Missions.	Christian Missions.
Foreign Missions.	The Empire with Reference to Church Work.
The Duty of the Church towards the Young.	Retention of the Young under Religious Influence.
Church Music.	Music as an Aid to Devotion in the Services of the Church.
Parochial Choirs.	

The Influence of Social and Sanitary Conditions on Religion.

Social Reforms with regard to
(1) the Housing of the Poor;
(2) Hooliganism—its causes and methods of cure.

The Spiritual Life.

The Virtues of Faith, Hope, and Love.

In addition, the following subjects were discussed in 1874: The Old Catholic Movement, Church Patronage, the Arrangements of Churches, Scepticism, Recreations, and the Education of Women.

In 1901 we are to have the following additional subjects: Authority in the Church of England; Temperance and Temperance Legislation; the Reformation Settlement; the Church in Relation to Journalism, Literature, and Art; Covetousness as exhibited in (a) Commerce, (b) Employment, (c) the Excitement of Chance; the Baptismal Vow; Prayer-Book Enrichment and Supplementary Services; Abstinence from Divine Service—Cause and Remedy; Difficulties of Country Parishes contrasted with those in Towns; Bells, Belfries, and Bell-ringers; Church Work in Public Institutions.

On the whole, therefore, the new programme contrasts well with the old. Perhaps there are too many subjects, but Brighton is expected to be a big congress.

The great prosperity of the last Brighton meeting may of course have been a reason for going there again. But it is curious how persistently some, apparently natural, centres of Church life have been ignored as Congress towns. Though it has visited several places twice, it has never yet been to Canterbury, Winchester, Bangor, Wells, Chichester, Ely, Gloucester, Hereford, Lichfield, Lincoln, Llandaff, Peterborough, Rochester, St. Albans, Salisbury, Southwell, Truro, Worcester, Durham, Chester, and Ripon. Some of these may be dismissed as impossible places, but others, and Canterbury amongst them, should hardly be overlooked.

The Bishop of Worcester has, like the Bishop of Bristol, taken a decided step against one of his extreme Anglican clergy. The Rev. Arnold Pinchard, Vicar of St. Jude's, Birmingham, has been inhibited from officiating outside his parish, and the license of the curate has been withdrawn. The offence was that of reverting to the ceremonial use of incense. The Liverpool correspondent of the *Church Times* complains that the Bishop of that diocese is also at work in this way, although on less public lines. He says: "The pressure is not open; there is no inhibition. But there may be pain, which is far harder to bear, the misunderstanding of those who once saw with their eye to eye, and, further than that, the reproach of others who make their loyalty very difficult of comprehension to the average Churchman." In this connection it may be worth remembering that, according to Bishop Creighton's biographer in the *Quarterly Review*, the prosecution of two London clergy would have been allowed to proceed but for what the Bishop regarded as the impatience of the layman who took action against them. Colonel Porcelli has, however, denied in the *Record* the part imputed to him.

The May meetings had, for the most part, excellent weather, and were well attended. The results of the year's work, as set forth by the various Societies, had been very largely anticipated, and there were no great surprises in store. The C.M.S. and the C.P.A.S. both announced anonymous promises of £10,000. The circumstances piqued the curiosity

of the Societies' friends all the more because it did not appear that the donor had been previously interested in the work of the Church. Unpleasant rumours as to the facts were finally confirmed by the following letter from Mr. Marshall Lang, the C.M.S. Lay Secretary, in the *Record* of May 17: "In an official statement regarding the C.M.S. deficit which you kindly published in your issue of May 3 it was mentioned that before the anniversary on April 30 a clergyman had informed us that he was authorized by a lady, who desired to be anonymous, to promise a donation to the Society of £10,000; and that, as the money would be forthcoming at once, he requested that the gift might be announced at the meeting, which was done. Circumstances have since occurred which show that the clergyman had been misled by the supposed donor, and that the promise, which he made in good faith, could not be fulfilled."

The level of speaking at the May meetings was not high, nor were there any addresses of exceptional interest. The anniversaries did not pass off without some indications of the watchful, and even critical, spirit in which utterances on these occasions are received. A sermon on behalf of one great Society, and a speech from the platform of another, occasioned a good deal of comment. Perhaps both the preacher and the speaker would have wished that their words should excite thought, interest, criticism, and questionings, rather than have been accepted in placid unconcern.

There has been a good deal of discussion of the article in the last number of *THE CHURCHMAN* headed by the question, "Is the Church a Failing Cause?" Some leaders of Church opinion frankly confess that they had not realized the extent and variety of the ominous signs found in the statistics in the *Year-Book of the Church*. But, unhappily, there is too much disposition to think that we should say as little as possible about ugly facts of this character, and live in hope that there will be an improvement next year. That, of course, is the policy which has so largely helped to bring about the present condition of affairs. It is not along those lines that improvement may be expected to come. They are the truer friends of the Church who, seeing the facts, feel that they demand something more than an "expectant" treatment.

Canon Gore's book on the "Lord's Supper" created a mild sensation in March. Early reviews in the *Times* and the *Record* pointed out that he was manifestly nearer the Evangelical than the decided High Church doctrine on the Sacrament. Upon this the *Church Review* discovered that Canon Gore was a heretic, who had been in the process of lapsing ever since "Lux Mundi" days. The book seemed at first likely to have important results. But the discussion of its contents lost life during May. Indeed, the moderate High Churchmen have so often shown timidity where courage on their part might have helped them to render signal service to the Church that, ecclesiastically speaking, nothing save gossip may come of the book. It is, however, an immense spiritual gain to have Canon Gore so far on the right side in this matter.