

eighteenth century, when, probably about the year 1738, it was rebuilt as a look-out for coastguard men and pilots, and so continued until recently, when it was taken down, and the site is now marked by an untidy heap of bricks and mortar and by two short sections of stone wall built between the granite boulders, and forming with them a stout rampart on the seaward side; but still the spot is invariably called St. Nicholas' Chapel.

It is seldom, indeed, that there is not a bronzed and weather-beaten fisherman squatting on the top of the wall and sweeping with keen gaze that blue expanse of ocean from far-off Trevoise Head to the nearer Carthew Rocks.

In 1649, when the chapel was in its prime, Godrevy Point, the opposite horn of the bay, was the scene of a historic wreck, when the ship containing Charles I.'s treasure was lost on its way to France, and almost every winter adds to the long, long tale of loss of life and property on the submerged reefs and rocky headlands that fringe the coast.

At present the Admiralty are the owners of the chapel, but they are proposing to hand it over to the Borough of St. Ives free of charge; and as the stones taken from the ancient structure have been preserved, it is not improbable that they may be replaced as far as possible in their old positions, and that there may again be a chapel of St. Nicholas on the island.

L. E. BEEDHAM.

THE MONTH.

NOT the least important and significant event of the past month has been the reduction in price of the *Record* from threepence to a penny. We congratulate our contemporary on its enterprise and true statesmanship in taking this very welcome step. For the first time the great body of Evangelical Churchmen have a weekly penny paper of their own, and in these days of cheap publications this fact will count for a great deal. Such a paper has long been needed—one that at the popular price of one penny would do for a wider circle of Evangelical and Moderate Churchmen what the *Record* has done at a higher price for the necessarily smaller constituency that could afford a more expensive paper. The first numbers of the new issue promise well in interest, variety, and helpfulness, and we wish the venture a large and increasing circulation. It is sometimes said that Evangelical Churchmen do not realize the value of the Press to the extent that others do, both inside and outside the Church of England. We hope that whatever truth there may be in this allegation will at least in part be removed by a hearty

response to the enterprise of the *Record*. At any rate, the clergy have now a fine opportunity of bringing before their people an effective means of spreading the truth and combating error in the spirit of Christian courtesy, fair-mindedness, and loyalty to the great foundation principles of the Church of England. The daily papers and the monthly magazines are among the most potent influences of the present day, and we could wish that the large body of Moderate Churchmen were more fully alive to the opportunities within their reach of doing good service by the circulation and recommendation of these forms of periodical literature.

No less than seven Bishops have recently been appointed (six English and one Welsh), and of these the only confessedly Evangelical is the clergyman appointed to the See of Llandaff. One of the six English Bishops would perhaps be correctly described as an Evangelical Broad Churchman, and the other five are High Churchmen of varying types. It is impossible to consider that this predominance of High Church appointments is either fair or wise. Evangelical Churchmen have a right to a fuller representation than this, and such a one-sided policy on the part of the Government bodes no real good to the Church of England. Not merely on the ground of right and justice to Evangelicals, but in the best interests of our Church, there ought to have been a more even representation. It is scarcely wise, to say the least, to appoint definite and pronounced High Churchmen to the episcopate at a time when the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline is seeking to devise means whereby ritualistic excesses can be reduced and brought to an end.

The completion of the Birmingham bishopric was worthily crowned by the enthronement of Bishop Gore last month, and we congratulate Birmingham Churchmen on the possession of a diocese of their own and on the commencement of a diocesan life so full of interest and helpfulness. Bishop Gore is wisely imitating the prescient statesmanship of the late Bishop Ryle of Liverpool in deferring to the next generation the work of providing a great cathedral for Birmingham. Bishop Gore rightly said that there is very much work that must precede that effort. Church extension, enlargement and deepening of the work of the Church, the multiplication of living agents and buildings, the furtherance of Church education, an increase of clergy, are all matters calling for immediate and careful attention, and, as the Bishop remarked, this will be work enough for the generation immediately in front of Birmingham Churchpeople. We cannot help feeling profound satisfaction at this welcome

testimony from such an unexpected source to the wisdom of Bishop Ryle. It is not so long ago that serious reflections were cast upon Liverpool, and upon its first Bishop, because a cathedral was not made the first and most important work of the new diocese. Time is the great arbiter and revealer, and now Birmingham, under a very different Bishop, is to follow exactly the same course as Liverpool in almost identical circumstances. In this connection we cannot help adding our warm congratulations to Birmingham on the appointment of Canon Denton Thompson as the Rector of St. Martin's. He will worthily maintain the Evangelical traditions of the parish church, and will prove a tower of strength to the Evangelical cause in the great Midland Metropolis.

The Bishop of Birmingham, on the occasion of his enthronement, put forth a very suggestive idea in the course of his speech in reply to the welcome given to him by Dr. Dale's successor, Rev. J. H. Jowett, the able and popular Congregational minister of Carr's Lane Chapel. Bishop Gore does not think it possible at present to attempt any large schemes of Christian reunion, but he considers that there are two lines of reunion which can and should be furthered. The one is fellowship in schemes of philanthropy and civic progress, and the other, upon which we wish specially to dwell, is fellowship in the common study of the origin and meaning of Christianity. Here are the Bishop's own words:

"What I want, so far as I may be allowed as a humble scholar to administer to it—what I should like to do is to bring together men of different kinds and different points of view, like Sir Oliver Lodge and Mr. Jowett, and a great number of people who are interested in these religious questions, in order that we may meet freely face to face with one another, get to know one another better, on the ground on which we stand, for I am quite sure we are in a time of transition, and that the lines both of union and division in the future are not altogether those which have prevailed in the past. It is in this freedom—in the fellowship of a common study of what our religion means—that I see the great forces of reunion in the future."

We believe this valuable suggestion is capable of very wide application, and is likely to have far-reaching results. We all know how much the Church of England is indebted to the scholarship of men like Dr. Dale, Dr. Fairbairn, and a host of other able writers, especially from North of the Tweed. And we cannot be unmindful of what our own scholars—Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, and Sanday—have done, and are doing, for the Nonconformist and Presbyterian Churches. If we add to all this the profound influence of German theology and the freshness and force of many American contributors to Christian literature, we can readily see what materials are at hand for the realization of Bishop Gore's idea. These separate schools

of theology should be brought together on some such lines as those on which Dr. Sanday has been working for years in Oxford, and on which the Society of Historical Theology has also been working. We should like to hear of and record other efforts in the direction of this fellowship of common study. We believe it would go far towards Christian reunion if we were enabled to understand more fully our bases of agreement, and also the conscientious grounds of our differences.

The Torrey-Alexander Mission in the Albert Hall is drawing to a close as we write, and shows no signs whatever of any diminution of interest. The crowds are as large as they were during the opening week in February, and the fact that day after day and night after night for two months thousands of people have gathered together to hear the simplest of Gospel addresses is a strong testimony to the firm hold that religion has on large numbers of people. Of the direct spiritual results of the Mission it is obviously not the time to speak, but we believe that among the most important and far-reaching results will be a repetition, though perhaps on a larger scale, of what took place during the Moody and Sankey Missions. The greatest effect will be to give a strong reminder to many parishes of the imperative need of evangelistic effort. That this lesson is being taught by the Torrey-Alexander Mission is already evident. The *Guardian*, in reviewing Dr. Torrey's last book, says:

"It reminds us that we ought to be far more evangelistic than we are. There are evidently fields white to harvest of which the ordinary methods of the Church of England take no account."

We are very thankful for this testimony. It is possible for a Church to pay disproportionate attention to spiritual life and culture, and to forget the claims of "them that are without." A ministry that is not evangelistic ceases to be, in the full New Testament sense, "evangelical," for the essential and inevitable expression of spiritual life is evangelistic effort for the unsaved. Neither can there be any doubt of the large numbers of the unsaved who attend our regular Church services. We hope, therefore, that the Torrey-Alexander Mission will lead to a wide adoption of evangelistic effort in connection with our ordinary services. We have all the materials at hand—buildings, choirs, and ministry—and what we need is a fuller realization of the imperative necessity of the ministry being a soul-winning ministry and the Church a soul-winning Church.

In this connection we are glad to see renewed attention being given to the fact that in many places our evening

service is not adapted to popular use by those who are unaccustomed to the Prayer-Book. The Head of the Oxford House, Mr. Woolcombe, has been calling attention to this fact, and the *Guardian* endorses his view, and urges the necessity of some well-considered attempt to relax the stringency of our present rules. Some modification and popularization of our services are absolutely imperative if we would attract the working people to our Churches. Adjustment will of course be difficult, and will only be accomplished by much wisdom and willingness to yield on both sides; but the object aimed at—the evangelization of multitudes now in every sense outside our Church—is of such primary importance that we are confident that the problem will be faced and solved in the true spirit. Great Nonconformist missions in populous districts on popular lines, in Churches which were formerly almost moribund, show what can be done given the right man and the popular service. We do not for an instant see any reason why the Church of England should not adapt herself to these new conditions, and gather into bright, popular, and yet perfectly reverent and devotional services a large number of people who are now never found within the walls of their parish Churches. We look with hope to the report of the Bishop of London's Evangelistic Committee, which was appointed at the last London Diocesan Conference, for we are convinced that along the lines of simple, popular, earnest, evangelistic services will be found the solution of the great problem of the non-attendance of the masses at Church.

One question of deep interest in connection with the Welsh Revival and the Torrey-Alexander Mission is the relation of revivalism to a particular theology. It is a simple fact, explain it how we will, that revivalism has invariably been associated with what is now often called "an old-fashioned theology." The names of Wesley, Whitefield, Jonathan Edwards, Finney, and Moody suffice to show this, and the question is whether this is necessarily the case, or whether revivalism and the simple preaching of the Gospel are compatible with what is generally known as a broad or "liberal" theology. There can hardly be any question that "liberal" theology and evangelistic work have not generally been found together, and it is equally certain that liberal theology has never yet appealed with any force to the great masses of people such as were gathered to Moody and Sankey's meetings, and are being attracted to-day in London, Liverpool, Manchester, and other large centres to Dr. Torrey's meetings. The old position, rightly or wrongly, has a strength that the new one has not yet shown, even if it possesses it. These

facts are worthy of the most careful consideration, and unquestionably call for the most earnest thought of all preachers and teachers. What is it that attracts men and women? Is it not the old Gospel of redeeming love and grace, the need of a Saviour by reason of an awakened conscience and a broken heart? Is it not because the preaching of the atoning sacrifice of our Lord gives immediate pardon and peace? At any rate, this *is* a Gospel, it is something that *can* be preached, and the results are seen with signs following. This constant association of revivalism and missions with a simple evangelical theology of sin, salvation, and sanctification, is a call to everyone to inquire as to the explanation, and we believe that the more inquiry is made the more it will be found that the old-fashioned three R's—Ruin by the Fall, Redemption by the Blood, and Regeneration by the Spirit—are at the very heart of the Welsh Revival and all the remarkable attendances at mission services throughout our country.

The "Official Year-Book of the Church" (1905), is always welcomed with great interest, for it shows, as perhaps nothing else can do, the remarkable extent of the work of the Church—so far, at least, as it can be tabulated in statistics. The voluntary contributions of Churchpeople for various objects in connection with the Church during the year ending last Easter amounted to no less than £7,811,673 12s. 5d. This was made up as follows: For general purposes, such as home and foreign missions, philanthropic, educational, and charitable work, £2,323,649 2s. 2d.; for various parochial purposes, £5,488,024 10s. 3d. The amount given for foreign missions was £818,351 16s. 3d., and voluntary subscriptions for the support of Church schools amounted to £452,536 17s. 6d., while a further sum of £170,873 6s. 3d. was expended on the erection of new schools or the enlargement of existing buildings. These sums are, of course, exclusive of anything in the nature of Government grants, and do not even include the contributions of Churchmen to such interdenominational societies as the Bible Society and the Religious Tract Society. These huge amounts clearly indicate the enormous resources of the Church of England, and show that, in spite of all the untoward features connected with ecclesiastical strife and religious indifference, there is a quiet work going on in multitudes of parishes, which means Christian liberality and service on a truly large scale. A Church that can contribute nearly eight millions per annum to Church work has almost untold possibilities within her, and the consciousness of this should encourage us to still greater efforts. Notwithstanding the vast sums

indicated by the above-mentioned figures, there can hardly be any doubt that Churchpeople have not come within measurable distance of the limits of their powers of giving. Less than one million for foreign missions is really ridiculous when we try to realize what this means from each parish of our land. Whilst we therefore thank God and take courage, in view of the splendid results recorded in the Year-Book, we must not fail to insist upon further progress, especially in the work of home and foreign evangelization. It will be seen that the funds raised locally for parochial purposes are more than double those that are devoted to general purposes. We believe that a reversal of these proportions would indicate a still fuller, stronger, and more vigorous standard of Christian living and service.

It was with great satisfaction that Churchmen heard last month that the Church Congress is to be held after all. Weymouth and the Bishop of Salisbury have come to the rescue. In spite of all the criticism that the Congress has incurred of recent years, it would have been a matter of regret if the meeting had been suspended this year, for a large number of Congress attenders are probably in favour of an annual rather than a biennial gathering. At the same time, we welcome the criticisms of the Church Congress recently put forth by the *Record*. The reforms advocated are certainly sweeping, but they appear to us to be worthy of most careful consideration on the part of those who are responsible for the gathering. It is pointed out that the Church Congress is not a growing institution, and that the attractions or otherwise of the Congress town have much to do with its success. The Congress programme, too, is usually devoid of originality, and many of the same subjects are discussed year after year. It is therefore urged by the *Record* that a permanent organization should control the Congress, that the afternoon meetings should be reduced to a minimum, that the cost of membership should be lessened, and that everything possible should be done to link on one Congress with another. We feel sure that these proposals will receive the earnest attention of Archdeacon Emery and his colleagues, for everything that will make the Church Congress a growing success and an increasing influence for good in the Church of England is to be welcomed. Meanwhile, we wish all possible success to this year's Congress at Weymouth. It may not be a large gathering compared with some of the former ones, but we feel sure that nothing will be wanting on the part of the people of Weymouth and the Diocese of Salisbury to make the gathering noteworthy in the annals of the Church Congress.

The foundation of the Sees of Birmingham and Southwark has naturally called renewed attention to the need of the increase of the Episcopate, and we shall not cease to regret that the occasion offered in connection with these new dioceses was not utilized for the purpose of making the English Episcopate approximate more closely to the primitive ideal. It is evident to all that as our Church is an Episcopal Church, the episcopal form of government should be realized in its best possible form, and this means in the first place an increase in the number of Bishops. We shall probably all agree that this increase will best be met by the creation of new sees rather than by the multiplication of new suffragan bishoprics. The primitive Bishop was not the Bishop of a large, unwieldy diocese, but, as Dr. Sanday said some years ago in the *Expositor*, he was more like the rector of one of our old parish Churches. If the Church of England is ever to return to that ideal, from which she has probably departed further than any other Church, a start must be made somewhere, and it is for this reason that we should have welcomed such a commencement with Birmingham or Southwark. This, however, is no longer possible, and it remains for Churchmen to face the problem afresh, and to discover the best means of realizing the primitive conception of the Episcopate. A recent proposal to divide the Diocese of Norwich and to create a bishopric for Suffolk is a step in the right direction, and we hope that the movement will be prosecuted to its completion. It is simply impossible for a Bishop to be a father in God to his clergy under the present conditions, and the consequence is, as Mr. de Winton said in the Canterbury House of Laymen on February 16 last, we have at present the spectacle of "an Episcopalian Church worked on purely Presbyterian lines." He might almost have said on Congregational lines. If, as we firmly believe, Episcopacy is of the *bene esse* of the Church, then the Church's "well-being" demands that our Episcopacy should be as effective and vigorous as possible. As the *Guardian*, discussing this subject, well said, we have gone away from the principle of Cranmer, who attempted to form counties into dioceses, and if we could only return to this idea, and also develop it into further schemes of subdivision, we should be doing great service to the efficiency of the Church of England. It is well known that Church life and work have developed whenever there has been a subdivision of dioceses and a creation of new sees. Liverpool and Newcastle are two out of a number of testimonies to this effect, and so we believe it will be with Birmingham and Southwark. The further we can extend the principle of subdivision, the more vigorous

will be the life and the more efficient the work of the Church of England.

EDITORIAL NOTE.—*The Editor is always glad to consider manuscripts with a view to their publication in THE CHURCHMAN. All communications should be accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope for the return of manuscripts that cannot be used.*

Notices of Books.

A History of the English Church. V. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. (1558-1625). By W. H. FRERE. London: Macmillan and Co. Pp. xiii + 413. Price 7s. 6d.

This fifth volume of the new "History of the English Church" has been awaited with some eagerness, the sixth having already seen the light a year ago. Mr. Frere is widely known as an ecclesiastical antiquary, and his pages are packed, as might be expected, with a great deal of information, including much about the Recusants and Nonconformists. The plan of the work precludes footnotes, so that matter which ought to be put into notes is often inserted in the text, and there can be no doubt that the narrative suffers in consequence, conveying the impression that the author's interest in the events of the time is the interest of the antiquary rather than of the historian. An account of the same period given in Dr. Hook's "Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury," two volumes of which are devoted to the biographies of Archbishop Parker and his four immediate successors, is decidedly inferior to Mr. Frere's in some respects. Dean Hook had strong prejudices, which he was accustomed to express freely, and sometimes he makes his readers very angry. But there is life and movement in his story. His historical characters, instead of being mere names, are felt to be real people of flesh and blood, about whom it is impossible to be coldly critical. It is just this touch of nature that the volume before us wants, and we do the author no injustice in remarking that it is impossible to tell from his pages how far he sympathizes with the Reformation. He is certainly not enthusiastic, nor is there here any recognition of the fact that doctrinally it was a return to the primitive model. The description of the form of faith and worship established at Elizabeth's accession as "a modification of the *Edwardine religion*" can only be called grotesque. Equally odd is the suggestion that the Bill for enforcing subscription to the Articles only received the royal assent because the Queen "was meanwhile making such an arrangement herself with Convocation as would supersede in part the action of Parliament." She was, Mr. Frere adds, "quite able to appreciate the humour of such a situation, and to enjoy such a means of getting her own way at Parliament's expense." What Mr. Frere is pleased to call "the humour of such a situation" happens to be purely imaginary, the truth being that he has made a serious mistake in his account of the circumstances on the previous page.