

THE CHURCHMAN

September, 1913.

The Month.

The Gospel and the Masses. DURING this passing August the Bishop of Manchester has for the ninth time conducted his annual Mission on the sands of Blackpool. For the second time Bishop Kempthorne, last year of Hull, now of Lichfield, has done the same at Bridlington. One of the editors of this magazine has had the privilege of taking a share in the work both at Blackpool and at Bridlington. Blackpool is of course the larger place, and its crowds are a never-ceasing wonder, their numbers, their versatility, and their orderliness being more than remarkable. Here services are held on the sands twice daily at five different stands. Bridlington is content with one large stand. In each of these two great pleasure resorts there is no question but that the Bishops' Missions are appreciated. There is never a sign of disrespect or contempt. Crowds come to the services, and they come to stay. As the Missions draw to an end there are many indications that not only are the efforts appreciated, but that they are definitely helpful in bringing back many who have wandered, and in winning some for the faith of Christ. The old Gospel is not played out; whatever men may say and however great indifference and sin may become in our modern life, the simple preaching of Christ crucified and risen is as attractive and as powerful as ever in its contact with the masses of our people. The preaching of the Gospel is the best apologetic. Blackpool and Bridlington are proofs of this,

and they are splendid encouragements to a vigorous evangelistic campaign in the parishes of our land. If we preach Christ, we can be content to believe that with the power of prayer behind it our work will be owned and blessed. The future is as bright as the promises of God can make it. It is for us to enter upon it with the impulse of its glorious hope.

The Bishop of St. Albans deserves the warmest
The Catholic League. thanks of the whole Church for his bold and vigorous action in the matter of the so-called Catholic League.

The whole story of this League, with its clandestine incursion into the Diocese of St. Albans and its unblushing Mariolatry, forms one of the saddest pages in the history of our modern Church. We are not disposed to attach too great an importance to it, but it does at least show that there are some members of the Church of England—we believe they can be but few—who do not understand the most elementary principles of loyalty. The Bishop has rendered extra and especial help by publishing the form arranged for the initiation service of the League. It is sometimes suggested that we are too fearful of the dangers of Romanism, and that there is no real peril to be afraid of. This League and the form which the Bishop has made public show that there is a body of men amongst us who are deterred neither by shame nor loyalty from bringing us back to the discredited and discarded superstitions of medieval Romanism. These men may be honest up to their lights, but if so, they are singularly unenlightened. Honesty would carry them into the Church of Rome. If it did, we should respect them. As it apparently does not, we can only take measures to prevent them from damaging the Church with whose real principles they are singularly out of harmony. Hence our pleasure at the Bishop of St. Albans action.

There is no need for panic. But the coming to light of this movement will surely help loyal Churchmen of every school of thought to realize that there must be no playing with our principles. The Catholic League will tend to bring together

Evangelicals and High Churchmen, who though they differ among themselves are loyal to the spirit of the Church of England, and so out of this evil good may come. The episode is the coming to the surface of a disease which the Church must cure for itself or succumb to before many decades are past.

A revised Prayer-Book has been issued from the **A Revised Prayer-Book.** Press. It does not bear the name of the reviser, though it might perhaps be easy to guess it, but it does carry a guarded imprimatur from the Bishop of Oxford. We are inclined to regret its publication, and do definitely regret its tendency.

We regret its publication because we fear it will strengthen the section of the Church who are against all revision. They will say if this is revision, we will have none of it. We for our part are anxious that the Prayer-Book should be adapted to modern needs, that something of elasticity should be given to our form of worship, and we have ventured to differ from many of our friends who have told us that we may lose more than we gain by revision. If the final revision is approximate to this new book, our friends will be right and we shall be wrong, but we do not give up hope yet, and we do not intend to give up effort.

We regret its tendency. Two voices claim a right to be heard in any process of revision—the voice of the Liturgiologist and the voice of the twentieth century. We admit the right of both voices. We venture to submit a principle which we had hoped all could agree upon: the doctrinal balance of the present Prayer-Book ought not to be disturbed. The attempt at revision before us gives greater heed to the Liturgiologist than to the needs of to-day, and in doing so seriously disturbs the doctrinal balance. We cannot but agree, therefore, with the comment of the *Guardian*: “We cannot think that the authoritative revision, when it comes, will bear any close resemblance to it (viz., this attempt), for the simple reason that what is here suggested is much more than our English temperament would ever consent

to adopt at a single step." We would for ourselves omit the last phrase of the *Guardian* comment; we trust that English Churchmen as a whole will never consent to adopt such a revision. We notice that the *English Church Review* expects before long another compilation in which the Protestant interests will be represented. We hope the *Review* will be disappointed. We Evangelicals who are interested in revision are not out for a party advantage; we are out for a satisfactory revision on the present doctrinal basis. We are sorry that this attempt at revision is using the occasion to hark back in some particulars to medievalisms, which were laid aside three hundred years ago.

It is to be hoped that due attention is being paid by all English Protestants to the attitude of the Roman Church towards mixed marriages. Our contemporaries *Work and Witness* and *Evangelical Christendom* have made public the conditions on which that Church grants a dispensation for a mixed marriage. The dispensation is only granted on condition that the Protestant partner will undertake to interfere in no way whatever with the religious obligations of the Roman spouse, and will further allow any children that may be born of the marriage to be baptized and brought up in the Roman communion. Over against this attitude of passive helplessness on the part of the Protestant, the Roman partner undertakes to strive to the best of his or her ability for the conversion to Romanism of the non-Roman partner. It is obvious that no such undertaking could or should ever be entered into by any man or woman who has a shred of Protestant principle or conviction. Any Protestant man or woman entering into wedlock on such terms as these may either at once accept the inevitable and become Roman, or may certainly contemplate a family life that is wrecked and ruined from the very start.

If any one thinks that the above is an unfair estimate of the influence of Rome on family life where the marriage is a "mixed one," let him read the tragic tale of that influence in families that are wholly Roman

"Father
Ralph."

as set forth in Mr. O'Donovan's novel *Father Ralph*. Not merely as a powerful story, but as a presentment of Roman Catholic religious life in Ireland in all its varied phases, the book is a document of primary importance. It is written by one who speaks from first-hand experience as a son himself of the Roman Church. The account of the various stages passed in preparation for the priesthood is tragic enough, but the point of pitiful horror and cruelty is reached in the narrative of Ralph's home-life in its gradual progress to absolute annihilation. And as the *Guardian* reviewer says, "Everyone who really knows Ireland knows that it is, every word of it, true." A Church which can enrich itself by domestic ruin in the fashion portrayed in this book is one that has departed far from primitive ideals. Those who have a leaning towards Roman ritual and doctrine will do well to study this graphic picture of the working of the inner life of that communion.

It is becoming increasingly clear that the cine-
The Cine-
matograph. matograph show as at present conducted is fraught with manifold peril to the children and young people of our land. In the current number of the *Hibbert Journal* Canon Rawnsley discusses the moral aspect of the matter, while the Headmaster of Eton speaks from the side of education. One of Canon Rawnsley's indictments is the pandering to a depraved appetite for horrors which seems to be so widely prevalent. He gives various instances of the terrifying and distressing effects on little children who were present. He opposes vehemently, and, we think, rightly, the present practice of reproducing scenes from Bible history, including some of the most solemn and sacred moments of our Lord's life, in the form of living pictures. There is no doubt that powerful vested interests are concerned in the matter. It is said that some ten millions of pounds sterling in England alone are invested in these enterprises. This makes it all the more necessary that those who wish to check the harm which indiscriminate and unrestricted attendance at these shows may do to our little

ones should combine in their several localities to support such measures as have been taken by the magistrates at Liverpool, Middlesbrough, and Carlisle for the safeguarding and protecting of young children in this matter.

The Head-
master of
Eton.

The cinematograph has been acclaimed as a new and potent instrument of education. The Headmaster of Eton deals faithfully and trenchantly with this point. It is utterly alien to that strenuousness and concentration which should be brought into play in any process which is to be called educational. "The influence," he says, "of the moving pictures is prejudicial to learning in exactly the same way as the reading of snippets of information in half-penny newspapers, only to a much greater degree." It is difficult to realize the confusion that must be produced in the child's mind by gazing constantly in a darkened theatre at rapidly changing pictures of every conceivable form of life all over the globe. It is indeed not only confusion that is produced, but unutterable weariness—possibly accompanied by the development of a new disease of the eye, already known to oculists as the moving-picture eye. It would appear, then, that the constant and indiscriminate use of the cinema is good neither for education nor for recreation; in fact, Dr. Lyttelton goes so far as to declare that in the case of the very young children unrestricted indulgence in it will result as a certain consequence in race suicide.

Truth New
and Old.

In the poem of welcome which he wrote for the recent visit of the French President to London, Mr. Rudyard Kipling characterized the genius of France in the following line :

"First to face the truth and last to leave old truths behind."

We quote the line, not to discuss its applicability as a summary of French life and character, but to suggest that it aptly portrays the ideal by which Evangelical thinkers and teachers

may well be animated at the present time. On the one hand let us be "first to face the truth." Let us have the "open" mind, which is quite a different thing from the merely shallow or impulsive mind. Let us be prepared to welcome new light from any quarter on Scripture or on Christian doctrine. But having welcomed it, let us then weigh and test and prove and discriminate, and in so doing let us be "last to leave old truths behind." The two attitudes of mind are not mutually antagonistic, but complementary. It is the man who has learned to value the earlier truth that has come to him, and who will therefore never lightly surrender it, who is most fitted to welcome and appreciate the truths that further life and experience may bring.

Lord Rosebery's allusion, in his speech to the boys of the Guildford Grammar School, to the subject of good manners was a timely utterance, and has given rise to some discussion. In the course of it, a writer in the *Times* has put his finger on the really essential point when he says that the really well-mannered man is he who has learnt the great principle of detachment. He thinks of the other rather than of himself. If he speaks of his own concerns it is only so far as he thinks they may be of any real interest to the other. For the rest, he does not speak of his own affairs or concerns at all, but devotes himself entirely to those of the other; not in a spirit of artificiality or suffering boredom, but with a real and genuine interest. The man who can do that is not only a good speaker, but a good listener. He has caught the spirit of that genuine unselfishness which is the essence of true politeness. He knows something of "the heart at leisure from itself." He has also something of that Christlike spirit which believes that there is something good and pleasant in each and is determined to discover and evoke it. It is well for Christians to bear in mind how large a part gentle gracious courtesy should play in the truly Christian life, remembering, too, that in Christ alone its power and its secret are to be discovered and possessed.

**Good
Manners.**