

contrary, nothing is more likely to lead to a strike among those ill-used underlings than an attempt to enforce those "relations" as stated on pp. 440-1. The standard of candidates for Holy Orders has lamentably fallen since a time that I can remember; and nothing is so likely as this to accelerate its fall and perpetuate its prostration.

I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.

THE MONTH.

SIR Stafford Northcote has been cordially received in Scotland: he urged that the Egyptian expedition was unnecessary. The Prime Minister at Penmaenmawr argued that the war had been waged from a love of peace; for a military anarchy had been pulled down. This argument Mr. Gibson at a Conservative meeting compared to a man's justification for beating his wife.

The Irish Land League seems to be dying of starvation.

The Bishop of Manchester, without waiting for official intimation that the three years have expired since the monition was first issued, with regard to Mr. Green, has informed Sir Percival Heywood, the patron, that the incumbency of Miles Platting is vacant. Mr. Green's supporters have pledged themselves yet further to resist the law.

At Bristol an address was presented to the Congregational Union, signed by the Dean, and a large number of leading Clergymen and Laymen.

The Rev. G. Arthur Connor, Rector of Newport, Isle of Wight, has been appointed Domestic Chaplain to the Queen, in place of Dean Wellesley, and also Dean of Windsor.

The Rev. John Reeve, Canon of Bristol, has entered into rest. The canonry left vacant has been conferred upon the Rev. J. Percival, President of Trinity College, Oxford, and formerly head master of Clifton College. Another "Liberal" head of a College, Dr. Jowett, has been appointed Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford.

The Rev. Randall T. Davidson, the esteemed and able Chaplain of the Archbishop of Canterbury, writes in the papers concerning the Church Deaconesses Home, conducted under his Grace's sanction at Maidstone. (See the *CHURCHMAN* for August, 1882, p. 393.)

At the Oxford Diocesan Conference, six representatives were elected (with the cumulative vote, we gladly add) for the Central Council, an amendment being rejected by 182 to 109. Mr. Henry Wilson moved that "it appears to this Conference desirable, in the interests of the Church, to promote the dissolution of the Church Association and the English Church Union," which was carried by a large majority.

THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

The twenty-second meeting of the Church Congress, held at Derby, was in many ways successful. It had nearly 4,000 members. As a rule the meetings were interesting and orderly: many of the speeches and papers were of a high order; and the Bishop made an excellent Chairman.

The subject "Neglect of Public Worship" was opened by the Bishop of Liverpool. In a very valuable paper, read with earnestness and power, his Lordship laid the main lines of the subject with his usual clearness:—

"It is a great fact which, I fear, admits of no dispute, that the working classes of England, as a body, are "conspicuously absent" from the public worship of God on Sundays. Census after census in our large towns has lately brought this painful fact before the public mind.

"This state of things, we must all feel, is eminently unsatisfactory, and deserves the best attention of a congress. But it is much more than unsatisfactory. It endangers the very existence of the Established Church of England. We cannot do without 'the masses.' The Church whose adherents are a minority in the land will not be long allowed to retain her endowments and her connection with the State in this age."

"But the absence of working-men from public worship," continued the Bishop, does not arise "from the spread of systematic infidelity among them." Secondly:—

"I believe it is a complete delusion to suppose that the working classes in England have any inherent dislike to the Established Church, and, if left to themselves, prefer the dissenting chapel. I believe nothing of the kind. I grant that our poorer brethren are very apt to judge the Church by the parson, and if he is not a satisfactory *persona ecclesiæ*, to take a dislike to the body which he represents. If, for instance, he is a thoroughly worldly man, "a Nimrod, a ramrod, or a fishing-rod," who neither does his duty as a preacher or a pastor—or, if he is one who in his zeal for ceremonial does things which they think are Romanism—it is very likely they will forsake the Church and stay at home, or go to chapel."

Thirdly, the old Gospel has not lost its power. The Bishop then made two positive suggestions—(1) More *direct lively preaching*¹ of the Gospel. (2):—"If we want to bring the working classes to Church, *there needs throughout the land a*

¹ The Bishop said:—Our clergymen, as a body, do not pay sufficient attention to the *way of putting things*. They forget that it is not enough to have good tools, if they do not handle those tools in the right way. Will any one tell me that Whitfield last century, or Moody in our own time, would ever have assembled myriads of working men, if they had only read cold, tame, orthodox, theological essays, couched in the first person plural number, full of "we" and "we," and destitute of warmth, vivacity, direct appeal, or fire? I will never believe it. But surely, if their style of address arrests and attracts the working classes, it seems a thousand pities that it is not more generally adopted.

great increase of sympathy and friendly personal dealing with them on the part of the clergy."

In a thoughtful, persuasive paper, the Bishop of Bedford gave some practical suggestions:—

I had no doubt at all [said the Bishop] that much of the neglect of public worship is to be traced to the dull, dry, dreary preaching which has too often prevailed. . . . Speak from your heart to the hearts of your people in language they can understand, and listeners will come. But I want rather to speak of the Prayers—taking the word popularly, of the service which precedes the sermon. I do not think it has always been the great aim to make the service intelligible, reverent, and congregational. Without great care a clergyman very easily lapses into an indistinct, over-rapid, indevout manner of saying words with which he is very familiar.

In a paper on the Harmony of Science and Faith, Professor Stokes (Cambridge)¹ said:—

To those who believe that the order of Nature is in accordance with the will of a Supreme Being, it must be axiomatic that there can be no real opposition between what we learn from the study of Nature

¹ The theory of ancestral derivation and the survival of the fittest is one which from its nature can hardly, if at all, be made a subject of experimental investigation, or even of observation in the records of the past.

The theory, I need hardly say, is highly ingenious; but any variation which we can actually observe goes but an infinitesimal way towards bridging over the interval which separates extreme forms, such, for example, as an elephant and a mollusc. Indeed, Darwin himself, as I am informed, was of opinion at first that we required at least four or five distinct centres to start with.

As to the origin of life itself, it was not intended on this theory to account for it, and the experimental researches of our foremost scientific men are adverse to the supposition of its production by spontaneous generation. Granting the origin of life by a creative act, we are not very closely concerned, theologically speaking, with the mode of creation. . . . But there is one point in which I think theology is more deeply involved, and respecting which it becomes a serious question whether there is any real scientific evidence in opposition to what seems at least to be the teaching of revelation: I allude to the creation of man. . . . Our whole ideas respecting the nature of sin and the character of God are, as it seems to me, profoundly affected according as we take the statement of Scripture straightforwardly, which implies that man was created with special powers and privileges, and in a state of innocence from which he fell, or, as we suppose, that man came to be what he is by degrees, by a vast number of infinitesimal variations from some lower animal, accompanied by a correspondingly continuous variation in his mental and moral condition. . . . The creation of man and his condition at creation are not confined to the account given in Genesis. They are dwelt on at length, in connection with the scheme of redemption, by St. Paul, and are more briefly referred to by our Lord Himself in connection with the institution of marriage.

Now, against these statements so express, so closely bound up with man's highest aspirations, what evidence have we to adduce on the side of science? Why, nothing more than a hypothesis of continuous transmutation, incapable of experimental investigation, and making such demands upon our imagination as to stagger at last the uninitiated.

and what we may be taught by a direct revelation from that Being. We cannot suppose otherwise without impugning the truthfulness of God. Any apparent opposition must therefore arise from some deficiency in the student of science, or in the student of revelation, or in both.

The *Guardian* justly remarks:—

There was in Derby a manifest current of opinion in favour of a more systematic and official incorporation of the laity in Church work and parish administration than has yet found place in our system. . . . That Mr. Albert Grey's Bill will ever pass in its present shape we should think most unlikely. But we have little doubt that the ecclesiastical affairs of our parishes will eventually follow the line of their civil concerns. They will, to a far greater extent than now, be managed by elective bodies; and, under proper conditions and safeguards, we have no doubt at all that such a change would prove both wholesome and conservative.

Mr. Grey's address was admirable; and it produced a marked effect. It is probable that some of the speeches protesting against Church Boards made not a few listeners perceive the need of some such measure as Mr. Grey's.

The Working Men's Meetings were unusually well attended, and the speakers, the Archbishop of York, the Bishops of Liverpool and Bedford, and others, were listened to with respectful attention. Large bodies of working men at the Midland Railway Station and in the premises of leading manufacturers were addressed by Bishop Ryle and other dignitaries.

The subject of the Diaconate was ably discussed. An interesting and suggestive paper was read by the Rev. E. R. Bernard. The Dean of Ripon,¹ the Rev. Jackson Mason, Mr. Sydney Gedge, Canon Medd, the Rev. W. O. Purton, Canon Woodhouse, and others urged the institution of an order of permanent deacons.

The question of the Central Council was introduced in an interesting paper by the Hon. Wilbraham Egerton, M.P. Canon Howell Evans (Oswestry) spoke well. The concluding speakers were Archdeacon Emery and the Rev. W. O. Purton, Rector of Kingston-by-Sea. Mr. Purton said that he had followed the Archdeacon at the Leicester Congress, and was glad to be able at Derby to point to the progress of this movement in the last year; the success of it, he added, was, in a great measure, due to the tact, largeheartedness, patience, and ability of the Arch-

¹ The Dean of Ripon said that the Church of England, with all her advantages, was undermanned and underpaid, for we had parishes with seven, eight, ten, or even fifteen thousand souls, committed to the care of one clergyman, with perhaps the assistance of a curate, provided by the Pastoral Aid or the Additional Curates' Society. Mr. Purton dwelt mainly on one point in Mr. Gedge's animated address, the question of money and men. The country he said has the endowments, and the towns have the masses of the people. For the increasing population, clergymen cannot be had.

deacon, whose Diocesan Conference work had been so signally successful.

One meeting at the Congress was stormy. At that meeting the Hon. C. L. Wood, the President of the E. C. U., spoke with plainness. The hon. gentleman pleaded for an optional use of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. Canon Hoare, called on unexpectedly, replied in a spirited and stirring speech. A more effective "bit of debating," to use the *Guardian's* words, no Church Congress has ever heard: "Many who did not agree with the speaker altogether admired the courage and readiness with which he grappled with his antagonist."

¹ The honoured Canon said:—"I wish to say that I think that this debate is a most important one for the Church of England. (Cheers.) I think that the speech of Mr. Wood, to which we have just listened, is one of the most important speeches that I have ever heard delivered at a Church Congress. (Cheers.) We used to be told that we Evangelicals were but poor Churchmen. We used to be told that what was originally called the Tractarian movement, but which has since been called the Ritualistic movement, was an effort of pious and devoted men to rise above our poor Churchmanship, and to bring out in better development the true principles of the Church of England. (Cheers.) We always, with that happiness which accompanies a clear conscience—('Hear, hear,' and laughter)—maintained that we were the true representatives of the Church of England. (Great cheering.) We acted upon the principle and its truth. But we have still borne a certain amount of reproach, and we have not been able to overcome the old prejudices. This day, however, we have been told by Mr. Wood, the President of the English Church Union, that our beautiful English Church Service is meagre: that there is nothing more meagre than our existing Liturgy; that our Holy Communion Service—in which we have taken so much delight—is a mutilated, an inferior, and a defective service. (Cheers, and 'No, no.')

I say 'Yes,' and this great assembly has heard too what Mr. Wood has said. (Cheers.) We have been told to-day that we are to go back to the Liturgy and to the Office of 1549. . . . We have learned something at this Church Congress. (Cheers.) We know where we are. We go home to-day knowing with what a power and an intention it is we have to contend. (Cheers.) We know what Mr. Wood has said. He has told us as plainly as possible that the object is to bring back the Church of England from the Reformed Church of 1552; but to stop just a little by the way in the refreshment room of 1549—(cheers)—and then we are to plunge head-foremost right into the Use of Sarum. (Great cheering, and cries of 'No, no; never, never.')

Now, then, my lord, what shall we say to this? Shall we have, or shall we not have it? (Cries of 'No, no; never, never.')

What, I ask, shall we say to this? Shall we stick by the blessed truths that we have received, and for which our Reformers died? (Cheers, and cries of 'Yes.')

Shall we cling to the dear old Office-book, from which we have hundreds and thousands of times poured out our whole hearts before God? (Cheers.) Shall we unite heart and soul as witnesses for Christ's coming there to His holy table—(cheers, and 'No, no')—and holding there communion with Him? (Cheers.) Shall we begin by half-and-half measures of a retrograde character, until we go right back to Rome? (Cheers, and cries of 'No, no; never, never.')

My lord, I wish now to say no more; but I wish to thank Mr. Wood for having spoken out so plainly on this subject, and for thus having let us know this day what are the real intentions of the English Church Union." (Loud and prolonged cheering.)