

lessly marred : so many of those little connecting words, which give life and continuity to a narrative, have been vexatiously displaced, that a perpetual sense of annoyance is created. The countless minute alterations which have been needlessly introduced into every familiar page prove at last as tormenting as a swarm of flies to the weary traveller on a summer's day. To speak plainly, the book becomes unreadable.

We lay the Revisers' volume down convinced that the case of their work is simply hopeless. *Non ego paucis offendar maculis*. Had the blemishes been capable of being reckoned up, it might have been worth while to try to remedy some of them. But when, instead of being disfigured by a few weeds, scattered here and there, the whole field proves to be sown over in every direction with thorns and briars ; above all when, deep beneath the surface, roots of bitterness to be counted by thousands, are found to have been silently planted in, which are sure to produce poisonous fruit after many days :—under such circumstances one only course can be prescribed. Let the entire area be ploughed up,—ploughed deep ; and let the ground be left for a decent space of time without cultivation. It is idle—worse than idle—to dream of revising this Revision.

We are greatly concerned : greatly surprised : most of all disappointed. We had expected a vastly different result. It is partly (not quite) accounted for, by the rare attendance in the Jerusalem Chamber of some of the names on which we had chiefly relied. Bishop Moberly (of Salisbury) was present on only 121 occasions ; Bishop Wordsworth (of St. Andrews) on only 109 ; Archbishop Trench (of Dublin) on only 63 ; Bishop Wilberforce on only one. Of these, the Bishop of St. Andrews has already fully purged himself of complicity in the errors of the Revision. Archbishop Trench, in his "Charge," adverts to "the not unfrequent sacrifice of grace and ease to the rigorous requirements of a literary accuracy ;" and regards them "as pushed to a faulty excess" (p. 22). Were three or four other famous Scholars (Scholars and Divines of the best type) who were often present, disposed at this late hour to come forward, they would doubtless tell us they heartily regretted what was done.

We understand that a second edition of Bishop McIlvaine's *Memorials*, by Canon CARUS, is in the press, and will be published shortly, with some additional matter of great interest incorporated in it.

Notices of *The Speaker's Commentary*, vol. iv. (Murray), Canon WESTCOTT'S *The Revelation of the Risen Lord* (Macmillan), Bishop RYLE'S *Facts and Men* (Hunt), Bishop THOROLD'S *The Gospel of Christ* (Isbister), and the Vicar of Epsom's *The Speaking Dead* (Stock), are unavoidably deferred.

THE MONTH.

CORRESPONDENCE concerning the Census has been full of interest. At the close of the year several letters appeared in the *Times* ; and in discussing the statistics of church and chapel attendance, a *Times*' leader made several references to the subject handled in the January CHURCHMAN by Dr. Robinson (The Sunday Morning Service ; the Need of Reform.) Thus, the *Times* spoke of the arguments which can be "adduced against the fusion or jumble of various services, constituting in the lump the Sunday morning service, and lasting at the pleasure of the preacher for an hour and a half to two hours, or more." The *Times* continued :—

Are the services of the Church of England adapted to the mental faculties and habits of the ordinary working man? . . . Are the services themselves suited for popular use? No doubt they were composed by excellent men, scholars and good writers, the best, possibly, in the nation; but these good men sadly overdid their work. The services are wordy, tedious, and reiterative. They make a constant demand on the attention, frequently with no other result than to satisfy its literary discernment. It must be considered that the Anglican Prayer Book was compiled and composed at a time when attendance was compulsory, and non-attendance was actually punished. All this is now changed.

A letter from Mr. Charles S. Miall contained some noteworthy allegations. Mr. Miall did not enter into the question how it came to pass that there was no religious census in the years 1861, 1871, and 1881: indeed, no regular and authoritative religious census in 1851 either.¹ But he says that the recently published returns of church and chapel attendance in many large towns go far to corroborate Mr. Mann's returns of 1851. We thoroughly agree with the *Times* that on the mere face of published statistics, "there come out several facts to which it behoves the Church of England to give its utmost attention." "Is the Church of England doing all that can be done to meet the occasion?"²

In a letter to the *Times* (Dec. 28) the Bishop of Winchester

¹ The *Guardian* (Jan. 18) says:—"The Liberationists knew very well that a real religious Census in England is quite practicable, but it would expose their weakness, and they, therefore, took measures to defeat this part of the Census Bill in the Commons. The recent device of counting attendants on some Sunday picked out by themselves in a few specified towns will hardly be deemed amongst reasonable men in any quarter to furnish statements which can be relied on about the respective strength of Church and Dissent amongst the English people." We may add, as to picked-out towns, that the presence of Roman Catholics makes a very great difference. In Liverpool, to which many critics turn, two chief causes must be reckoned, the shifting of population, and the great proportion of Roman Catholics. On these points some able letters have been printed by Canon Hume. The influence of Bishop Ryle will soon be felt.

² Giving a table, Mr. Miall says: "These statistics show that the Established Church had 36·9 per cent. of the entire attendances in the six towns referred to, and the Nonconformists of all sections, 55·6 per cent. The meaning of this is that the Church of England, in a numerical sense, is no longer the 'National Church,' though it greatly surpasses in numbers every other religious body in the land." Referring to the subject generally (Chapel as well as Church attendance), he adds: "Here is a far more important subject for anxious consideration than matters relating to Ecclesiastical Courts of Appeal, to the cut and colour of vestments, or to the claims of the clergy to independent representation in diocesan synods. In view of the facts I have endeavoured to summarize, such demands appear to be a complete anachronism—I had almost said, supremely ridiculous."

admitted that there is plenty of room for the warning of the leading article. "There was always said to be a danger that the English Church should die of respectability. . . . We want mission work of all kinds in our towns and alleys and in our heaths and hills. Mission chapels, open-air missions, services suited to untrained tastes, sermons that tell upon the feelings without offending the wisdom, and above all the enlisting of a much larger army of workers from every class, rich and poor, high and middle and low, to work as sub-deacons, lay-readers, district visitors, and deaconesses and mission-women. There is nothing whatever in the genius of the National Church unfavourable to all this, though there may be in the prejudices of her members." His Lordship added:—

I have not the least intention of detracting from the zeal of Nonconformist ministers or Wesleyan class leaders, or of denying the good which they are doing among those whom their influence reaches. But, as a matter of fact, their influence reaches more to certain classes of society than to others; and those classes are what we commonly call the middle and lower middle classes. The upper classes are, with very rare exceptions indeed, Churchmen. The lower classes are in much larger numbers Churchmen than Dissenters. This latter fact is apparent from the statistics of all public institutions. Hospitals of all kinds, workhouses, gaols, the navy, even the army (though so largely recruited from Ireland), are found to contain Churchmen generally in the proportion to Dissenters of three to one. So baptisms, marriages, and burials are three to one in church when compared with chapels and registrars' offices. How is it that in our great towns this does not show itself in church attendance? Probably for two reasons. One is that the country parishes contain the large proportion of Church people, but the manufacturing towns contain the great bulk of the Nonconformists, the causes for which are not far to seek. The other is that, unhappily, in our larger towns the operatives and labouring men have ceased to attend either church or chapel, except in very small proportions—it is said only one in fifty. So it comes to pass that in our larger, especially our manufacturing towns, the church and chapel attendance is chiefly drawn from the middle classes, among whom, undoubtedly, is the great strength of Dissent. This being so, it is really surprising to find that the attendance at church almost equals the attendance at all the different Dissenting chapels put together in many of the great towns.¹

For ourselves, we are persuaded that the reforms which have

¹ Replying to the Bishop's letter in the *Times*, the Rev. J. Guinness Rogers wrote: "The principal qualification on which the Bishop insists is one that every fair-minded man would admit, that, if we are to have an accurate estimate of the position of the Church in the country, these returns must be supplemented by others from the rural districts, where, in his belief, the strength of the Church lies. But, while admitting the necessity for this more complete survey, I may venture to doubt whether it would be as favourable to his cause as his Lordship supposes. We can, however, deal only with the figures before us. They have their own

been advocated in THE CHURCHMAN are urgently needed. For instance, Elasticity in our Services; the Lay-Diaconate; a large Increase of Mission Rooms; the Redistribution of Endowments; organized Lay-help, according to patent needs; the Union of small contiguous Country Parishes. The ordination of pious and zealous men, admirably suited for work among the masses, who cannot, and will not, spend two years in any College, seems most desirable. As to the Sunday Morning Service, some changes, we believe, are quite as necessary for rural as for urban churches.¹ A rector or vicar, where there is no curate, is, in many parishes, unable to avail himself of the provisions of the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act, as he desires to do. Some twelve years ago "Canon Ryle" wrote strongly in favour of shortening and simplifying the Services. The incumbent of a large and important manufacturing town writes to us:—"I thoroughly agree with the CHURCHMAN in these matters."²

These are the subjects to which the Convocations might, in the coming session, well devote themselves. How great the need of reform in the Lower Houses of Convocation!

In a Pastoral Letter, the Bishop of Carlisle³ refers to the Central Council:—

Perhaps this Council is the germ of what the Church requires. Let it work. Let it find by experience what it can do and what it cannot

distinct tale to tell, and the Bishop is, at least, partially conscious of their ominous significance, though, perhaps, he hardly sees how much they suggest. Taking it for granted that the operatives and labouring men, who are supposed to form the strength of the Church in the villages, neglect public worship when they are massed together in large towns, he thus explains the position of Dissent in these towns:—"In our larger, especially our manufacturing towns, the church and chapel attendance is chiefly drawn from the middle class, among whom, undoubtedly, is the great strength of Dissent." These are very striking admissions. These large towns, where Dissent has such power, are recruited from the country parishes, in which the Church has had so long a tenure of influence. It must be, therefore, that when the working men forsake their country home they forsake the Church also, and become either absentees from public worship, or else swell the ranks of Dissent. The Church, at best, can have had but a feeble hold upon them. To assume that they still remain attached to her is a very large and gratuitous hypothesis indeed.

¹ An inquiry as to communicants in country as well as in urban parishes has been made of late. In the Chichester Diocesan Conference a year or two ago this subject was touched upon.

² A correspondent, whose position and experience give weight to his words, writes with reference to our remarks in the December CHURCHMAN, p. 221. He says:—"The Lay-Diaconate is a subject on which I have long been interested, and one which, in my judgment, assumes more pressing importance every day. Indeed, I fail to see how by any other mode than the extension of the Ministry by an unpaid Diaconate the present and increasing spiritual destitution is to be met."

³ Referring to the recent Manchester Synod and Mr. Wood's letter, the Bishop says:—"The proceedings had "the support of the chief clergy of

do. Experience will show. I for one cannot and dare not prophesy ; but I find it hard to believe that a body of Englishmen, half clerical and half lay, elected freely throughout the country, and meeting together with a full sense of their responsibility, without the possibility of taking one-sided party views, and with the knowledge which they must have of the Church's needs, can meet altogether in vain. May the Holy Spirit of God prosper the movement !

The endowment of the Newcastle Bishopric has been completed. Mr. Pease, a member of the Society of Friends, gave a suitable residence for the new Bishop.

On the subject of the persecution of the Jews in Russia, the Earl of Shaftesbury and the Bishop of Oxford have written to the *Times*. The Bishop says :—

May I, in answer to Lord Shaftesbury's appeal in *The Times* of today, express my conviction that Englishmen do *not* wish to continue silent in the face of the atrocities now perpetrated daily and hourly on the Jewish race by subjects of the Emperor of Russia? I should not venture to put myself forward in this matter had I not been one of those who, in 1876, took a public part in the protests made throughout the country against the barbarities practised by the Turks in Bulgaria. We were sometimes told in reply that the Russians were as bad as the Turks. I, for one, indignantly denied the force of the retort. I said that Russia, with all her faults, did, at least, maintain civil order among her people and had never been guilty of that kind of government by massacre with which centuries of iniquitous misrule had made us familiar in the history of the Turks. I said, further, that the Russians did not make war on women and children, whatever might be their severity in dealing with men.

All this must now, with shame and sorrow, be unsaid. If the tale of horror which you told us last week has not been exaggerated, the people of a considerable portion of the Russian Empire have been perpetrating deeds as black as any that were done in the darkest ages ; and their rulers have contentedly looked on. Surely this is a case for as plain a protest as we English people can utter before the civilized world.

In the last CHURCHMAN, in the article on Evening Communion, "Presbyter" referred to the rubrics in the "Order of the administration . . ." according to which the Holy Communion must follow the Sermon and Morning Prayer. He also referred to "an old Canon which expressly forbids the celebration of the Holy Communion before Matins." Inquiry having been made

the diocese ; true, they had been adopted deliberately and solemnly. What signify such little circumstances as these? A stroke of the pen from the President of the English Church Union is enough to blow them all into space. The passage in which it is asserted that '*we shall not be cajoled into surrendering up the rights and liberties of the Church of England, &c. &c., is surely Popery in a new form. The clergy of the diocese of Manchester are not allowed time to consider in what way they shall treat their Bishop's solemn appeal before a Bull issues from London denouncing the whole proceeding, and declaring authoritatively what *we* do or do not intend to do.*'

with regard to this Canon, "Presbyter" requests us to state in THE CHURCHMAN that it will be found in Dean Goulburn's "Commentary on the Lord's Supper" (new edition, 1875), published by Messrs. Rivington. The Dean's words (p. 303), are:—

I have somewhere seen an old Canon, though I cannot now lay my hand upon it, which strictly forbids (what now finds so much favour) the Celebration of the Communion before Matins. The fact is that these and other points of discipline vary, and must vary, with the varying exigencies of social life. There must be a plastic power in the Church by which discipline may be adjusted to the habits and wants of those who are subject to it.

In a Note at the close of his Commentary, the Dean says:—

Just before the appearance of this New Edition, the Rev. H. T. Armfield, of Salisbury Theological College, is good enough to furnish me with the words of the English Canon (against celebrating before Matins), to which reference is made in the Appendix, p. 303, note 11. They run thus:—

"Nullus insuper sacerdos parochialis præsumat Missam celebrare, antequam Matutinale persolverit officium, et Primam et Tertiam de die."

Mr. Armfield adds, that by the Sarum rubric the celebrant could only know what collects he was to use at the Mass from having said his Matins. The rubric he refers to is thus given in a foot-note to his valuable work on "the Gradual Psalms" (p. 371):—

"Notandum quod in omnibus Dominicis et in festis cum regimine chori per totum annum, hoc generaliter observatur, ut ad missam tot dicantur Collectæ quot dicebantur ad Matutinas, nisi in die Nativitatis Domini."

The Islington Clerical Meeting was held on the 18th. About 500 were present. Prebendary Wilson¹ presided. The general subject was the Importance of Clear Dogmatic Teaching, treated in reference to the Moral Government of GOD, to the Person and Work of the Saviour, to the Mode of Acceptance with God, and to the Sanctifying Work of the Holy Ghost. The readers of Papers were Sir Emilius Bayley, Dr. Flavel Cook, Canon Hoare, and the Dean of Ripon. The speeches and Papers were excellent. We quote the close of Dean Freemantle's Paper as follows:—

What is wanted is more depth of spiritual experience, more of the principle of spiritual life in order to make the teaching practical. Half measures, lukewarm opinions, intellectual theories, party bigotry, sensational excitements, and sacerdotal pretensions, will not uphold the work of God when his truth is put to the test. They who are to witness for Christ in such times as these must be standard-bearers, must be what Mede calls the sealed one's *subsignarii*. They must stand in the power of the Holy Ghost, and with boldness confess the

¹ In his impressive address, the President said:—"It is cheering to me to see so many younger brethren gathered around us, prepared, I would fain hope, to take the place of those whom we have lost, and who will, I trust, rejoice to maintain the same standard which has ever been our rallying point—a firm attachment to our beloved Church, with a holy resolution to maintain inviolate her Protestant and Evangelical doctrines, and to transmit them in all their integrity to future generations."

faith of a crucified and risen and returning Saviour. The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God. They must have—

1. An implicit and unshaken confidence in the inspiration and authority and sufficiency of Holy Scripture as a rule of life. 2. A pure and fervent love to Jesus, and to all who love Him in sincerity. 3. A consistent, simple, and self-denying life and conversation, and growing conformity to the very image of Christ. The true evidence of a sealed one must be found in the inner man, and not in mere outward privilege or profession.

And in the coming struggle the battle will have to be fought out, not between copes and chasubles and the scarf and surplice, not between Church and Dissent, not between an Establishment and Voluntarism, but between truth and error, between Christ and Antichrist. Let anyone read up the history of the commencement and progress of the French Revolution, and he will then see the very same principles at work which are rampant in Russia, in America, in Ireland, and in other parts of Europe at the present moment. Democracy and irreligion are rising up like a flood against the powers ordained of God both in Church and State to preserve order and peace in society. Even in England, if the calculations which have been made lately approach anything near the truth, we have the masses of working men chiefly, and of others, amounting to very nearly two-thirds of the population, who are under no religious influence whatever so far as public worship is concerned. The Nonconformists have failed to reach them, and if the Church were disestablished they would be in no better condition to reach them than they are now. The Church with all its difficulties is doing much, but with its present funds and the increase of population the existing staff of clergy is incapable of meeting the wants of the day. We want just what was wanted a few years ago, when we were threatened with invasion and the regular army could not be kept up in sufficient numbers to secure the safety of England. A volunteer corps was inaugurated, and has grown up to a state of efficiency scarcely, if at all, inferior to the Imperial troops; and if the zeal of patriotism could accomplish so great a work, will not the higher and more holy love of Jesus kindle a missionary spirit amongst our pious laity to consecrate their spiritual gifts to the service of the Church? We want volunteers sanctified and sealed, men who will give themselves to such work as they can do in the spirit of Philip, and Stephen, and Prochorus, and Nicanor, who will be admitted formally into the diaconate, not by a mere permissive license from the Bishop, but by a distinct ordination, to a definite locality, under the discipline and subject to the existing law of parochial and pastoral and episcopal authority. Such an accession of workers, teachers, visitors, evangelists, and helps would enable the Church to carry out the true object and intention—and it is a very blessed one—of an Established Church, namely, to visit from house to house, and minister to every individual in the parish. But for this, as I have said, we must have a higher stage of sanctification than we have yet reached, or, if we have reached it, it has not been developed. We must get beyond what has been described as the ankle-deep and jelly-fish Christianity, and launch out into the deep, if we would have a net full of fish.