

of the human race."¹ In other words, the Christian life is human life lived on the highest plane, and the relationships which should subsist between Christians are the natural relationships of everyday life perfectly discharged.

Thousands of young people go into the battle of life most imperfectly equipped, because they have not been taught the necessary connection between conviction and conduct, between doctrine and everyday action. They have not been taught how to use weapons of long-tried and well-proved efficacy, which yet are lying ready to their hands. When they learnt at school the rules of arithmetic, they were set to do examples. The practical utility of the rules was at once forced upon them, and they have been, perhaps unconsciously, "doing examples" ever since. When the Catechism is taught, examples must be given: these must be "set" again and again. It is only by this method that the deepest and most important problems of life can be successfully worked out.

W. E. CHADWICK.

The Month.

"OF a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons." This was the text chosen by the Bishop of London for his sermon on the Sunday after the announcement of the King's illness, and it would be difficult to recall a more dramatic illustration of the words than was afforded by the events in what should have been Coronation week. When God's hand is laid upon anyone there is no alternative but to submit, whether the subject of His discipline be King or peasant. The Coronation and the festivities connected therewith had to be abandoned, and the nation, which, in spite of the growing spirit of worldliness, is at bottom religious, sought refuge in prayer. Who can doubt but that the speedy recovery of the King, in which the nation is now happily rejoicing, is due to the intercessions that have been offered in his behalf? The very day following the announcement of his illness some 3,000 or 4,000 people assembled in Queen's Hall and there engaged in prayer that, if it might be God's will, the King's life might be spared, and that His Majesty and the nation and empire might learn the true lesson of this national chastisement. This meeting was a representative and responsible one, the presence at it of the Bishops of London, Durham, Winchester, and Ripon showing that its solemn import was well recognised.

The business before the Convocation of Canterbury at the July group of sessions was not of a very interesting character. The Bishops missed a great opportunity when they spent a whole sitting in editing the Resolutions on Clerical Poverty sent up to them from the Lower House,

¹ Hort, "Christian Ecclesia," p. 228.

for they did not alter the substance of the proposals, but only the details. The Church has waited long for a really good lead from the authorities on a question which is pre-eminently one of real importance—viz., the support to be given to the clergy of the Church, many of whom are in most serious financial straits. The Lower House of Convocation spent its time in examining and amending the learned Report on the Position of the Laity, and the same subject also came before the House of Laymen, who passed resolutions in favour of the establishment of a National Church Council, the status and powers of which have still to be defined. But there seems very little hope of anything being done in this direction so long as the laity of the Church are as apathetic as they are now. The House of Laymen for the province of Canterbury is often held up as an example of an ideal Lay House on a voluntary basis. But is it so? The attendances are meagre. On the very day, for example, when this great constitutional change was discussed there were, perhaps, thirty present, while the average attendance at the sittings for any one year would not, it is feared, reach higher than forty.

The proposals for a National Church Council naturally include the establishment of a Lay House. For a long time past the difficulty has been to determine what shall be the qualification for the electors to that House. In regard to the elected there is a tolerably full consensus of opinion that they must be communicants, and a certain school of Churchmen have pressed that this qualification shall also be required in the electors. On the other hand, there is a section that is quite prepared to abide by the present Vestry franchise. How to reconcile these conflicting views has been the problem which has exercised the minds of many of the leaders of the Church Reform campaign. At one time it seemed impossible that the gulf between the two parties could ever be bridged; but the first sitting of the two Houses of Laymen at the Church House on Thursday, July 10, came to a decision, which it is expected will satisfy all but the extremists. The following resolution was carried:

“An equal number of parochial representatives of every ecclesiastical parish or district attached to an old or new parish church in the diocese (including the district remaining ecclesiastically attached to the old parish church of an ancient parish which has been ecclesiastically subdivided), shall be elected by such of the persons now by law qualified to vote at the election of churchwardens in and for the ecclesiastical parish or district as declare themselves in writing to be lay members of the Church of England, and of no other religious communion, and are not legally and actually excluded from Communion, and by such other persons residing in the ecclesiastical parish or district as are lay communicants of the Church of England of the male sex and of full age.”

The decision of the Court of Appeal on July 10 in the case of *Herbert v. McQuade* will be received with very deep regret by a large number of clergy. Stated shortly, the point in dispute was whether a grant made to a clergyman from the Queen Victoria Clergy Sustentation Fund was or was not liable to income tax. The Divisional Court held that the grant was not taxable. It was pressed (the Judge said) against a poor and peculiarly helpless man, and it was only a fortunate accident that there were a number of equally poor and helpless men of the same class who had probably helped him to resist what they held to be an unfounded claim on the part of the officers of the Crown. This was in May, 1901. Now, in July, 1902, the Court of Appeal, brushing all sentiment aside, has held that these grants are taxable. The Master of the Rolls laid it down—and he was supported by Lord Justice Stirling

and Lord Justice Mathew—that “the grants made to this incumbent were profits which accrued to him by reason of his office, notwithstanding that the persons who paid him the sums were not under any legal obligation to pay them.” The appeal of the Crown was therefore allowed. The one redeeming feature in this litigation is that the Revenue authorities have had the grace to pay the costs of the appeal. But it is much to be hoped that the case will not be allowed to rest where it is. The question affects all the poorer clergy of the country, and an appeal should be made to the House of Lords. The Rev. G. N. Herbert, of Norwich, who, in fighting this case, has rendered a distinct service to the clergy, may well appeal to Churchmen for funds to enable him to take the case one stage further—viz., to the highest Court of Appeal in the land.

It is still uncertain who will be chosen as the President of the Northampton Church Congress. The Bishop of the diocese is unhappily still suffering from the effects of his accident, and it is certain that his place must be filled by another. The *Times* hints that Bishop Mitchinson may be chosen. From a purely diocesan view such a selection would be admirable, but the Congress is for the Church at large, and it is essential to its success that the President be generally well known. The Committee might well invite the Bishop of London or, failing him, the Bishop of Ripon to take the Chair; either of these prelates would ensure the popularity of the Congress. The list of speakers which was published on July 9 does not show much power of originality on the part of the Committee. It is true that there are several new names; it is a misfortune that they are also unknown. Of the more or less regular Congress speakers there are the Bishop of Ripon, who spoke at Newcastle in 1900, and at Nottingham in 1897, and presided at Bradford in 1898; Canon Hensley Henson, who was at the Brighton Congress last year, and at Shewsbury, 1896; the Dean of Norwich, who has spoken four times at Congresses during the past ten years; the Bishop of Salisbury and the Bishop of Hereford, who have also taken the platform four times in a like period. Members who were at Brighton last year and remember the quiet and impressive speeches of Mr. G. A. King on Missions will be glad to know that he is to speak at Northampton on “The Direction of the Individual in Spiritual Matters.” The Rev. T. W. Drury, Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, and a distinguished member of the Bishop of London’s Round Table Conference on Confession and Absolution, will also speak on that subject. The Bishop of Durham and the Bishop of Rochester, who are to preach the sermons, will also take part in the Congress Meetings, the former speaking at the Devotional gathering on Prayer, and the latter at the Education Meeting. Bishop Talbot will find a strong supporter in the Bishop of Coventry, whose striking paper at Newcastle on Education made a deep impression.

The attack on Evening Communion has been promptly met. The *Record* of July 11 published a special supplement containing a learned article by the Rev. N. Dimock, in which he dealt with the evidence from antiquity; and a large budget of letters from representative clergy all over England, giving their testimony to the value of the practice. Their letters conclusively established these four main lines of defence: (1) That the proportion of their communicants who attend evening celebrations is large; (2) that many of these would not, and some could not, attend ante-meridian celebrations; (3) that there are no symptoms of the disorder or profanity which are alleged as possible or actual dangers of Evening Communion; and (4) that Evening Communions are

a decided help to the spiritual life of their parishes, and that the suppression of them would impair that life. The supplement has been reprinted for general circulation.

The Education Bill is passing through deep waters. The three principal amendments which have thus far been accepted by the Government are, however, distinct improvements. In the first place, much of the financial burden has been shifted from the local rates to the State; secondly, the Cowper-Temple clause has been introduced as a safeguard for Secondary Schools; and in the third place, the optional clause has been struck out, which, in plain language, means the death-knell of School Boards. But the real battle is coming over the proportion of outside managers to be introduced into the new authority over Voluntary Schools. The Bill provided for one-third; the opposition are fighting for two-thirds. A select party of weak-kneed Unionists has memorialized the Government to reconsider their position on this question. But any increase in the proportion would be disastrous to the cause of Church Schools, and it is at least conceivable that if it were introduced many Churchmen would prefer to see the Bill dropped.

Reviews.

Historical Christianity the Religion of Human Life. By the DEAN OF CHRIST CHURCH. London: Henry Frowde.

WE are grateful to Dr. Strong for giving us these lectures delivered to University Extension students. They offer an answer to the question often heard from doubting lips, "Is Christianity played out?" The reply is, that the revelation of Christ, the final declaration of God's purpose, is a completely adequate assurance of man's hopes. It is adequate because it stands on a firm historic basis, and is verified by experience. Substitutes for this faith have been endeavours to substitute ideas for facts, and such endeavours have always failed. Dean Strong further points out that the position reached by Harnack is only attained by tearing the New Testament to tatters, and assuming that the whole history of the Church has been a series of errors. That is an inconceivable state of things, making the history of religion differ from all other history.

The Gospel of the Kingdom. By HENRY BAILEY, D.D. London: S.P.C.K.

The rapid development of missionary literature is a good sign, and these sermons, preached in Canterbury Cathedral by the late Warden of St. Augustine's College, belong to a class of literature of which much more is needed. It is scarcely possible that foreign missions should have won, comparatively speaking, so little attention if clergy had spoken to their people with the plainness which marks these sermons. Dr. Bailey speaks decisively of the missionary obligation and the evangelical commission; he makes great use of the example and methods of St. Paul; and he everywhere lets it be seen that the authority for missions must be found, not in consideration of their secular advantages, but in the manifest directions of our Lord.