

from all diocesan organizations, cannot be advantageous. It is true that principles are often stated on the Church Congress platforms from which Evangelical Churchmen must dissent; but whether Low Churchmen attend or stay away, those principles will be championed. Is it not better that men should be there to challenge those things, to refute them (if they can), to present the other side with as much force as possible? And if men already attend who can do this, ought not those who feel with them to be present in person in order that any who stand forth to state or defend their side of the question may be well supported in the audience? Evangelical Churchmen have no reason to dread criticism of their position nor discussion of its details. Why should not the minority who view the Church Congress with hesitation or alarm and refrain from its membership lay aside their hostility, and unite with others to secure that the cause of loyal and sober Churchmanship shall always have their watchful and judicious aid at the sessions of the Church Congress?

A. R. BUCKLAND.

The Month.

THE article with which the Bishop-designate of Durham opens the new series of the CHURCHMAN is in the nature of a warning and a plea. It is a warning, for no school of thought can long flourish which is not supported by some measure of learning, and of the learning which is set before the public. If young authors are not coming forward on the side of Evangelical and moderate Churchmen, the principles held by them will assuredly lose ground. It is also a plea—a plea for more accurate and careful study, but also inferentially a plea for more encouragement of learning and authorship. We very much hope that this latter aspect will not be overlooked.

The November number of the CHURCHMAN will contain an article by the Rev. N. Dimock on "Conscience and the Gospel."

Early numbers of the CHURCHMAN will contain three articles by Dr. Wace on "Protestant Theology in the Sixteenth Century," and Dr. Henry Gee will write on "The Elizabethan Communion-Table."

Dr. Monle's appointment to the See of Durham was received with very unusual unanimity. But the accession of a third Cambridge Professor to the diocese of Lightfoot and Westcott produced from the *Guardian* a curiously ill-timed protest against the policy of choosing a Low Churchman for Durham. The theory of the *Guardian* apparently is that representatives of the three schools of thought should be sent in regular succession everywhere. The assumption that the theology of Dr. Moule is much the same thing as the theology of Dr. Westcott will come as a surprise to most people. Moreover, it can scarcely be a secret that in the latter part of his life Dr. Westcott so far yielded to High Church influences as to give that party advantages which were received by many other

people with surprise as well as regret. Possibly the sudden term set to the play of those influences by the appointment of Dr. Moule may have something to do with the protest made. But, as the *Record* pointed out, the plea for alternating the schools of thought comes a little late in the day. Why was it not made when High Churchmen succeeded High Churchmen in the Sees of London, Oxford and Chichester? Perhaps, however, the *Guardian* was looking as much to the approaching vacancy in the See of Worcester as to that which had been filled at Durham.

Professor Moule will be consecrated Bishop of Durham in York Minster on St. Luke's Day (Friday, October 18). We do not doubt but that he will on that day be especially remembered in the prayers of all who thankfully recall his past work, and look with the highest hopes to his discharge of new and still graver responsibilities.

The prospects of the Brighton Church Congress are good, and the meeting should be really useful. Some curiosity is felt as to how the endeavour to make "speakers" speak, and not read their addresses, will fare. There are indications that some of the speakers will disregard the direction, and others obey it by delivering addresses already in type. But in a few cases a really "live" debate may be insured. The programme has not undergone many changes, and the lamentations over the dropping of the "Church and the Press" subject was hardly worth raising. In too many cases the discussion has in the past been largely confined to persons who had little or no experience of the press; and those who have knowledge are indisposed to think that a Congress debate on the subject could be of much value. It was duly proposed to the committee of the London Congress, when the few members with special knowledge of the subject were against its appearance on the programme.

The choice of Northampton for the Congress of 1902 is natural, and in full accordance with Congress precedent. The Congress is long overdue in the Midlands, which have hardly been visited as often as might have been expected. Moreover, the Bishop of Peterborough has not yet had an opportunity of presiding over a Church Congress, and that, according to Congress rule, is a reason for visiting his diocese. It is curious how cathedral towns are avoided; but visits to manufacturing centres are likely to be of much more service to the Church.

The Rev. Henry Lewis, Rector of Bermondsey, is one of the clergy who have boldly tackled some of the more urgent social problems of poor parishes. He has broken a lance with local authorities over the question of overcrowding, and has shown that the incumbent of a parish can take up the work of a social reformer without loss of his spiritual influence. Mr. Lewis has contributed to the *Record* two articles on the treatment of Christian Socialism and of social questions of Evangelical Churches, which have attracted some attention. Perhaps his use of the title, "Christian Socialism," was likely to alarm some people; for although the Bishop of Liverpool and the Bishop-designate of Durham are both members of the Christian Social Union, there is a good deal of suspicion of the phrase. Mr. Lewis means by it nothing more than the application of Christian principles to social life, and all who know the strong common-sense which marks his character will be well aware that he is not likely to champion wild or fanciful schemes of social reconstruction. He is not, therefore, developing any new doctrine or any strange application of Evangelical principles, but he does contend that Evangelicals are not alive to the greatness of their opportunities in this matter. It seems to be supposed

in some quarters that they neglect social work altogether. According to Mr. Lewis, "Again and again it is said in the most public manner by Labour papers and Labour leaders that Evangelical Churchmen have no sympathy with the poor in their sufferings from overcrowding, from the difficulty of obtaining employment in certain localities, from the awful forms of poverty which are among them, from the cruel nature of certain trades, and from the growing evil of compulsory residential divorce from the prosperous classes. They leave it to others to speak of these things. They never plead the cause of the helpless toilers against the crushing forces of our marvellous (but in some aspects of it savage) civilization. They are silent upon the terrible inequalities between the rich and the poor. They are enthusiastic for the heathen abroad, but of enthusiasm for the worse-conditioned heathen at home they have none. All this, of course, is untrue. Evangelicals are, and always have been, among the most laborious and self-sacrificing friends of the suffering poor among the masses. But the masses are ignorant of it. Other schools have got their ear, and Evangelical Churchmen have not got it, for the simple reason that they have not tried to get it. They have done their work without advertising it. They have not troubled to use the press. They have avoided rather than courted the Church Congress platform. Neither have they put any of their strength into the production of an Evangelical socialistic literature. And for these reasons both Church and people have been led to think that Evangelicals in the Church of England are not interested in modern social problems, and that as a school they do nothing for them."

Mr. Lewis urges that Evangelical Churchmen cannot afford to be misunderstood in this way. That is so. But even more important than the correction of a misstatement is the urgent need of more social work. Much of it is being done, and well done, by Evangelicals. Other men may only want a little stimulus and guidance. We are glad to see that a regular conference of clergy in charge of very poor parishes is in contemplation.

Distinguished leaders of English Nonconformity often visit the Australian Colonies, and are of material assistance to the causes of their co-religionists there. Distinguished clergy of the English Church seem to be less frequent visitors, but the meeting of the Australian Church Congress at Adelaide at Michaelmas next year will offer an occasion of which some prominent clergy might well take advantage. The Bishop of Adelaide, in pleading for such visitors, says :

"The Motherland and the Greater Britain beyond the seas are now bound together by the strongest ties. Australia has given of her best to the service of the Empire in South Africa, and the federation of the Colonies is another element of progress and a fresh inspiration for spiritual work. At this most interesting epoch in our history we should be greatly stimulated and encouraged by the presence of representatives of the Mother Church at the Congress, the members of which will be gathered from all parts of this continent to take counsel for the advancement of the kingdom of God in Australia. The hospitable instincts of Australians are proverbial, so that I need scarcely assure any visitors of a very hearty welcome; and we think, moreover, that a close acquaintance with the ecclesiastical and social problems that confront us in the Sunny South cannot fail to prove of much interest to them. I may also add that the climatic conditions of this 'Queen City' of Adelaide at Michaelmas are delightful."

Any clergy or laity who are disposed to think of such a visit to Australia should communicate with the Hon. Sec. of the Congress, the Rev. Canon Samwell, Rector, Port Adelaide.

The assassination of President McKinley created a deep feeling in the United Kingdom—a feeling which was reflected in the religious services of the Sunday after his death and of the day of his funeral. There was no such manifestation of interest and sorrow here at home when the Emperor of Russia, the Empress of Austria, the King of Italy, or the President of the French, were murdered. After all, blood is thicker than water; and a common speech, common literature, common habits of life, make ties which, in the moment of trial, we all rejoice to feel. The simple piety of the American President counted for much in the eyes of the English people. Both he and his successor, President Roosevelt, spoke with some enthusiasm of foreign missions at the Ecumenical Conference held at New York last year. Mr. McKinley, in the course of a warm eulogy of the work and its workers, said: "The story of the Christian missions is one of thrilling interest and marvellous results. The sacrifices of the missionaries for their fellow-men constitute one of the most glorious pages of the world's history. The missionary, of whatever Church or ecclesiastical body, who devotes his life to the service of the Master and of man, carrying the torch of truth and enlightenment, deserves the gratitude and the homage of mankind." Mr. Roosevelt bore personal testimony to the work of missionaries amongst the Red Indians. One passage is worth recalling: "I saw a missionary gathering on one of those Reservations—just as much a missionary gathering, though not of the same grade, as is this here to-night. It was a gathering in which 99 per cent. were Indians; where the father and mother had come in upon their lodge-poles two hundred miles over the prairie to attend that missionary Conference; where they had their mothers' meetings and other branches of work arranged; and where all the practical details of the Conference were carried out by the Indians themselves, helped by the white missionaries, but doing it mostly for themselves, subscribing out of their little all that they could, that the work might go on among their brothers who were yet blind. It was a touching sight—a sight to look at, a sight to learn from."

One of the most interesting and most charmingly illustrated books on the war, is that of Mr. Mortimer Menpes, the artist and war correspondent. Unhappily it contains some very sweeping condemnations of all army chaplains at the front, save, if we remember right, those of the Roman Catholic faith. The Methodists felt keenly the allegations made, especially in regard to one of their number. Happily Mr. Menpes has publicly recanted. In his letter he says: "From information I have received since the book was written, I am satisfied that I saw only one side of the question of which I treated, and that I gave undue credence to untrue information as to the chaplain of whom I spoke. I am therefore the more distressed at the misunderstanding. I regret exceedingly that the chapter was introduced into the book at all, and I can only say that if the volume had to be written over again I should either omit those pages altogether, or else modify them considerably. In the next edition I shall certainly suppress them, and thus—so far as is in my power—make full reparation." People who are accustomed to the charges so freely made by some observers against missionaries and their converts will be disposed, perhaps, to wonder how often the example of Mr. Menpes ought to be followed.

It is not often that the Vatican blunders as badly as it has done over the "bones of St. Edmund." After all the inflated language of the Pope, Cardinal Vaughan and the English Roman Catholic press as to the distinction which the new Westminster Cathedral would gain by housing these relics, it must have been a trying task to admit that the bones are

not St. Edmund's after all. Cardinal Vaughan says that so long as you suppose a relic to be genuine, it really does not matter much whether it is or is not; but the doctrine has been received with more amusement than assent.

Reviews.

HOMILETICAL AND DEVOTIONAL LITERATURE.

Thoughts for the Sundays of the Year. By. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D.
London: R.T.S.

THIS volume appeared just as the public learned that Professor Moule was to succeed Dr. Westcott in the See of Durham. By those who do not know its author's works it may be read in search of guidance as to his teaching. Written, as much of the volume was, for an undenominational magazine—the *Sunday at Home*—it is confined to the treatment of such truths as are received by all Evangelical Christians. But whilst this may in some quarters be deemed a defect, it may elsewhere be recognised as a distinct advantage; for at least it shows us how great are the truths which unite the Churchmen and the Nonconformists for whom Dr. Moule originally wrote. Apart, however, from this characteristic, the book is one of real and permanent value. In these meditations for Sunday the doctrines of the Christian faith and life are set forth in due proportion, illustrated from the resources of a scholarly and observant mind, and everywhere presented with a gentle persuasiveness hard to resist. We commend the book to all in search of devotional literature, which, in the right sense of the word, may edify. Clergy should especially note how accurate scholarship and wide reading can be made subservient to the purposes of simple teaching. Too often simplicity is supposed to condone or demand superficiality of treatment. This book is a lesson in the art of plain instruction.

A Course of Sunday-school Lessons for the Year beginning Advent, 1901.
By the Rev. G. NICKSON, LL.D. Liverpool: Sunday-school Institute.

In the stress of work now falling on the clergy everything which helps towards the development of lay help must be cordially welcomed, and no lay-helpers are of more fundamental importance than Sunday-school teachers. Yet it may be questioned if, however widely we may find Christian zeal and devotion, there is always a sufficient training for the work. There are, indeed, plenty of manuals for Sunday-school use, but too many of them are simply attempts to save the teacher trouble, and furnish him with the lesson exactly as it is to be given. Aids of this kind, a sort of feeding-with-spoon food, will no more make good teachers than the free use of "cribs" will make schoolboys into good scholars. We have more pleasure, therefore, in calling attention to this little book. It covers the Gospel of St. Luke up to the beginning of the narrative of the Passion, and 1 Samuel, and seems to us to be exactly what such a book ought to be. Fifty-two lessons are provided. In each case the idea and scope of the lesson is shown, the central thought which must underlie the whole preparation. Notes follow on the subject-matter of the lesson,