

judge me a slihter of his truth and the souls of men, and lest in my best sermon I should be guilty of their blood." "Take heed unto thyself," writes St. Paul to Timothy, "and unto the doctrine. Continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee."

C. CLAYTON.

ART. IV.—COMPREHENSION.

IN the eye of the law of England the Church of England is, for many purposes, though not for all, co-extensive with the people of England. In this view "Church and State" is the same body regarded under different aspects. The State is the Church, viewed in its secular aspect. The Church is the State viewed in its religious aspect. Many illustrations of this might be given. Take the parish. In estimating the population of a parish, no subdivision of the parishioners into "Churchmen" and "Nonconformists," or "Churchmen" and "Dissenters" is ever made. In forming a new Peel parish, in building a new district church, the population is dealt with *in globo*, and not in a fragmentary, and (so to speak) schismatic, way. The notion that the parson's cure of souls is limited to the actual members of his "congregation" is utterly opposed to the genius of the Established Church. It is purely a dissenting notion. All who reside within the bounds of the parish are the parson's parishioners, and have a common interest in his spiritual ministrations. That interest is certainly not limited by any denominational landmarks. Take another illustration—the vestry. The vestry is an assembly of the parson, churchwardens, and the parishioners contributing to public burthens. The parson is *ex officio* chairman of the vestry. Is a vestryman asked whether he is a member of the Church of England? No. It is assumed that he is so. The only test is his qualification as a ratepayer.

Let us ascend higher, and take the two Houses of Parliament. It is a source of dissatisfaction to many that a body which is said to be composed of men of various denominations, or of men of no denomination at all, should be permitted to legislate for the Church of England. But the State makes no inquiry into the creed of the members of the Legislature. Its only test is the oath of allegiance—loyalty to the Sovereign. It is, to all intents and purposes, assumed that the members of the Legislature are members of the Church of England. Parliament legislates for the Church of England. Why? Because the Church of England is the English nation. The English nation, through

its chosen representatives and the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, legislates for itself—in Church as well as in State. “Quod omnes tangit ab omnibus tractari et approbari debet.”

There is nothing which ought to endear the Prayer-Book so much to Englishmen as the fact that it is interwoven with our national life. The first Prayer-Book of Edward VI.'s reign emanated from the authority of Parliament. The second Prayer-Book of Edward VI.'s reign emanated from the authority of Parliament. The Royal Prerogative smoothed the way for the Legislature by appointing Royal Commissions to prepare the measures to be submitted to it. The Prayer-Book of Queen Elizabeth's reign emanated from the authority of Parliament. Convocation opposed it, passing resolutions in favour of the Pope. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge opposed it. Yet so powerful was the tide of national feeling in its favour, that, in spite of the antagonism of Lords Spiritual, it passed the House of Lords in two days; and it passed the House of Commons in three! There was no Royal Commission to smooth the way of the Legislature in this case, only a small committee of divines, meeting at the house of Sir Thomas Smith! Oddly enough, it was this extremely *secular* Prayer-Book which first contained the Ornaments Rubric!¹

The Statute-Book of the Realm, and the public documents issued by virtue of the Royal Supremacy, bear eloquent testimony to the large and comprehensive spirit in which our parliaments and sovereigns desired to act in effecting ecclesiastical reforms. In the very first sentence of the first statute of the reign of King Edward VI. we find these words:—

The King's most Excellent Majesty, minding [*i.e.*, desiring] the governance and order of his most loving subjects to be in most perfect unity and concord in all things, and, in especial, in the true faith and religion of God.

Parliament, in the recital to the first Act of Uniformity of King Edward VI. (2 & 3 Ed. VI. c. 1), declares that its motive for approving of the Book of Common Prayer is a consideration of—

The favour of God and the great quietness which, by the grace of God, shall ensue upon the one and uniform rite, and order, and external ceremonies to be used throughout England.

The warrant of Charles II. for the Conference at the Savoy, after a brief recital, proceeds as follows:—

We, in accomplishment of our continued and constant care and study for the peace and unity of the churches within our dominions,

¹ See, as to this, Dr. Cardwell's "Conferences on the Prayer-Book."

and for the removal of all exceptions and differences from amongst our good subjects, for or concerning the Book of Common Prayer, or anything therein contained, do appoint you to advise upon and review the said Book of Common Prayer.

The Commission issued by King William III. and Queen Mary for a review of the Liturgy in 1689, after a short recital, proceeds thus :—

We, out of our pious and princely care for the good order and edification and unity of the Church of England, committed to our charge and care, and for reconciling, as much as possible, of all differences among our good subjects, and to take away all occasions of the like for the future, have thought fit to empower you to meet and prepare such alterations of the Liturgy and Canons, as, in your judgments, may most conduce to the ends above mentioned.

Thrice, in the post-Reformation period, have golden opportunities presented themselves of establishing corporate reunion between conforming and non-conforming Churchmen: on the accession of the House of Stuart, on the restoration of Charles II., and on the accession of William and Mary. If it was the fault of James I. that corporate reunion was not achieved at the Hampton Court Conference, it certainly was not the fault of Charles II. that corporate reunion was not established at the Savoy Conference, or of William III. that corporate reunion was not effected by the passing of the Bill "for uniting His Majesty's Protestant subjects." James I. detested the Puritans, and, writing to a friend of his in Scotland, he said, describing the Hampton Court Conference :—

We have kept such a revel with the Puritans as was never heard the like. I have peppered them as soundly as ye have done the Papists there. . . . I have such a book of theirs as may well convert infidels, but it shall never convert me, except by turning me more earnestly against them.¹

A Conference conducted in such a spirit was not likely to be productive of any beneficial results. Charles II. and William III., as we have already seen, were not of the same stubborn disposition. The Savoy Conference failed, according to Dr. Cardwell,² "owing to the headstrong disposition of the Nonconformists," and especially of Richard Baxter.³ Both parties, however, seem to me to have laboured to achieve, not "unity and concord," but victory. Bishop Burnet⁴ ascribes the failure of the

¹ Cott. Libr. Vespasianum, F. 3.

² "History of the Conferences on the Prayer-Book," p. 261.

³ The presentation to the Conference of an *entirely new Prayer Book* composed by him is an illustration.

⁴ Bishop Burnet's "Own Times," vol. iv. p. 59.

efforts to carry a measure of Comprehension, on the accession of William and Mary, to the Jacobite clergy, who "raised such a clamour" against it, that they "prevented its being carried." The authors of the "History of Dissenters,"¹ ascribe its failure to the "violence of the spirit of the times."

In the Archbishop of Canterbury's recent opening Visitation Address, at Croydon, his Grace used the idea of Comprehension in a much wider sense than that with which we are more immediately concerned. "The Church of England," he said, "seems to me to be more and more becoming a centre for *all* the Churches which protest against the Roman usurpation." He instanced the Syrian, Armenian, Chaldean, Nestorian, Coptic and Greek Churches, — Oriental Christianity; the Old Catholics; the Swiss, German, and French Protestants; the Moravians; the Swedish Lutheran Church; the Protestant Churches of North America, Episcopal and Non-Episcopal; and the Protestant Dissenters at home. "The circle of our influence," said his Grace, "is extending. . . . The Oriental Christians show a lively interest in our co-operation, and desire to know more of us, and to act with us in a fraternal spirit." "It will be our own fault," he added, "if *all* the Protestant communities throughout the world, episcopal and non-episcopal, do not feel that their cause is indissolubly united with ours." It must be highly gratifying to all loyal Churchmen to learn, on the testimony of so competent a witness as his Grace of Canterbury, that the Church of England is attracting to herself the affectionate regard and esteem of the entire mass of non-Papal Christianity, both Oriental and Protestant. God grant that she may prove herself worthy of the faith and hope reposed in her!

It is evident, however, that the Church of England, herself a National Church, cannot in the nature of things enter into corporate union with the Oriental Churches, or with foreign Protestant Communions. She may form a "centre" for them to rally round, but she cannot absorb them or amalgamate with them. The body which has been most successful in illustrating the power of British and foreign Protestants to concentrate their energies into one focus is the Evangelical Alliance. But "alliance" is a very different thing from corporate union.

It may not be uninteresting to note the aspects in which this question of "Comprehension" is viewed by the three great schools of thought—as they are now euphuistically termed—in the Church of England.

The Broad Church view has found an amiable exponent in the Dean of Westminster. Writing to the *Northern Echo*, in

¹ Vol. i. p. 207.

reference to some remarks of the editor on "The Nationalization of the Church"—a phrase used by the *Times*, in reproducing the letter—Dean Stanley observes :—

1. You propose that, under certain regulations, the various Non-conforming communities might make use of the parish church for their own religious services at such hours as would not interfere with the regular services. This is perfectly permissible at present. For six years I tried the experiment in Westminster Abbey. . . . What was done in Westminster Abbey is lawful in every parish church in England. The only difference is that, the Dean being the Ordinary, there was no need for reference to the Bishop. But unless the Bishop, as Ordinary, interposed to prevent it, there is nothing in the law which could preclude any parish clergyman from acting on the same principle. . . . The clergyman in charge should be made responsible for the services conducted.

2. You propose that the terms of subscription should be relaxed or modified. Probably you are not aware that all the subscriptions which existed in former times are swept away. About twelve years ago a Royal Commission considered the subject, and introduced changes so radical that the subject . . . has never been revived. The declaration of belief that "the Thirty-nine Articles contain nothing contrary to the Word of God," the declaration of assent to "all and every the Thirty-nine Articles, besides the ratification"—once required from all clergymen and graduates—no longer exist. In their place has been substituted a brief assent to the doctrine of the Church of England as contained in the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles. The word "doctrine," rather than "doctrines," was deliberately adopted by the Royal Commissioners. . . . It is true that there remains that slight and colourless adhesion of which I spoke just now, and the change from that form to its certain abolition would be far less than was accomplished by the change from the complicated and grievous entanglement which existed previously. . . . Bishop Burnet long ago recommended that all such preliminary adhesions should be abolished, and any Government which acted in his spirit would confer an inestimable boon on the Church of England.

The *Times* commented favourably on the part of Dean Stanley's letter which advocates the celebration of Nonconformist worship in parish churches at hours when it would not clash with the regular Church services. "As a rule," observed the *Times*, "all churches are not used more than three hours in the week, and it does seem not very unreasonable to ask whether they could not be lent for an hour or two to those who are ready to use them." "Mutual charity prompts the wish for *moral union*, rather than exaggeration and perpetuation of formal, often merely nominal differences." The *Globe*, on the other hand, ridiculed the Dean's proposal, on the ground that he "offered the Nonconformists precisely what they did not want and would not have. In their view the churches are [already]

national or parochial property, and should be at the disposal of Baptists or Quakers, or even Secularists, as much as of the members of the Church of England."

The Bishop of Liverpool, at the Leicester Church Congress,¹ dealt incisively with Dean Stanley's proposal. He said:—

I dismiss, as utterly unworthy of notice, the new-born idea that the Church may be nationalized, and Church and Dissent brought together by turning our parish churches into pantheons (great cheering), and throwing open our pulpits to preachers of all denominations. Anything more absurdly Utopian and unpractical I cannot conceive. (Cheers.) I will not waste the time of Congress by dwelling on it. It is liberality run mad. (Laughter and cheers.)

If Dean Stanley had confined his proposal to the admission of orthodox dissenting ministers to Church pulpits on exceptional occasions, I hardly think Bishop Ryle would have denounced the proposal so vigorously, considering the *empressement* with which he spoke of "trained and educated dissenting ministers," and of "serious God-fearing Nonconformists," and "thanked God for the work done by Trinitarian Dissenters." Nothing can be more unwarrantable than Dean Stanley's fashion of lumping up "the various Nonconformist communities." Orthodox Dissenting ministers exchange pulpits freely; but they do not admit Unitarians or Secularists to their pulpits.

With regard to Dean Stanley's second proposal, that clergymen should be no longer required to declare their assent to the doctrine of the Church of England, as contained in the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles, it would, in my opinion, if carried out, do something worse than "turning our parish churches into pantheons"—it would turn the Church of England—our spiritual mother—herself into a pantheon.²

¹ See the *résumé* of his speech in the November number of THE CHURCHMAN, p. 132. See also the *Times*, Sept. 3, 1880.

² Since writing the above, Dean Stanley's address on "Subscription" has been published in the January number of *Macmillan's Magazine*. It is [in Dean Stanley's most gentle and winning style. Its leading arguments, however, appear to be these:—Subscription failed to bind the consciences of the Tractarian clergy of 1844—of the men who "claimed to hold every Roman doctrine compatibly with the signature of the Thirty-Nine Articles;"] therefore it should be abolished. This seems to me tantamount to an argument that law should be abolished on account of the existence of law-breakers. The minds of the Tractarians of 1844 had become saturated with the equivocations and mental reservations of the Mediæval schoolmen, before they ventured publicly to maintain that the Thirty-Nine Articles were to be understood in a "non-natural sense." Ingenuous minds were alienated from Tractarianism when they were brought face to face with the casuistries by which these men sought to

I now pass on to consider the aspect in which the question of "Comprehension" is viewed by High Churchmen.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his Visitation Address, at Croydon, while looking with satisfaction on the *rapprochement* between the Church of England and the other "Churches which protest against the Roman usurpation," considered that "the Oxford revival" has contracted "Churchmen's sympathies" "in the direction in which before they were ready to expand." "My predecessors," he said, "in the Episcopate had, I think, less difficulty than we should experience nowadays in welcoming the co-operation of such men as was Robert Hall in the days of our fathers, and wishing them 'God speed' in their labours to resist the prevailing infidelity." It is a remarkable fact, however, that the most enthusiastic supporters of the movement for the Comprehension of Dissenters at the present day are very High Churchmen, like Earl Nelson, the Dean of Manchester, and Mr. Talbot. They have formed a Society called "The Home Reunion Society," "to present the Church of England in a conciliatory attitude towards those who regard themselves as outside her pale, so as to lead to the corporate reunion of all Christians holding the doctrines of the Ever-blessed Trinity and the Incarnation and Atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ." The Society declares its inability "to support any scheme of Comprehension compromising the three Creeds or the Episcopal Constitution of the Church," but its willingness "to advocate all reasonable liberty in matters not contravening the Church's faith, order, or discipline." It will be seen that the Society is based on much more Catholic principles than the "Society for Promoting the Unity of Christendom," which declined to recognize, as Christians, any except members of its three pet communions—the Anglican, Greek, and Roman Churches. Some of the objects of the Home Reunion Society are excellent; one is, "the promotion of freer social intercourse between Churchmen and Nonconformists;" another, "the removal of all defects and abuses in the practical

defend their position in the Church of England. If there had been *no subscription* there would have been *no standard* by which to judge them.

Again. Dean Stanley argues that "*if* one of the causes" of "the failure of gifted men to enter Holy Orders is the small shred of subscription that remains, every man who cares for the welfare of the Church should spare no endeavour to abolish it." For every "gifted man" that the abolition of subscription would attract to Holy Orders, I venture to say scores of "gifted men" would be repelled. The paucity of "gifted men" who enter Holy Orders is due to the *latitudinarianism* that exists within the Church, and the powerlessness or reluctance of the constituted authorities of the Church to grapple with and restrain it. The remedy of Dean Stanley (*vide* his Address) would seem to be to introduce Quakers and Unitarians into Holy Orders!

working of the Church's system, which may justly give offence to Nonconformists ;" another is, " the appointment of committees to arrange for conferences with Nonconformists."

The Society has succeeded in drawing upon itself a good deal of attention at the Diocesan Church Conferences held during the last year or two. At the Peterborough Diocesan Conference, held in October, 1879, the following resolution was carried :—

That, in full recognition of the sin and scandal of divisions among Christians, and in humble consciousness that they have been promoted and encouraged by many shortcomings on the part of the English Church, this Conference would hail with the utmost satisfaction any proposals tending towards home reunion, without compromising scriptural truth and apostolic order ; and that, while unable to perceive that the time has arrived for formal communications between the authorities of the Church and delegates from Nonconformists, it is of opinion that special attention should be directed to a possible concordat with Wesleyan Methodists.

The allusion to " formal communications between the authorities of the Church and delegates from Nonconformists " had reference to a resolution moved by the Dean of Peterborough, " that it is desirable that the archbishops and the bishops and other representatives of the Church should invite delegates from the *orthodox* dissenting bodies to a Conference, with a view to consideration of the terms of reunion." This resolution was too advanced for the meeting, and the resolution previously mentioned was substituted for it. The allusion to a " concordat with the Wesleyan Methodists " was no doubt suggested by two prize Essays of the Home Reunion Society by Mr. Mowbray and the Rev. V. G. Borradaile on the subject of " An Eirenikon for the Wesleyans." Mr. Mowbray formulates the following " scheme " for the reunion of Wesleyan Methodists with the Church :—

1. A certain number (say three or four) of the Wesleyan ministers in full connexion, nominated by the Conference, to be ordained and then elevated to the Episcopate for the purposes of (1) conferring, or assisting in conferring, episcopal ordination upon their brethren ; (2) ordaining, or assisting at the ordination of, future candidates for the ministry ; (3) confirming and (4) generally exercising Episcopal supervision over the Order. These bishops to act as suffragans of the bishops in whose respective dioceses their episcopal functions are to be exercised, to whom and to the Metropolitans of their respective provinces they would owe canonical obedience. Each of these suffragan bishops, except one who would represent the Order in the Upper House, to have seats in the Lower House of Convocation of their province.¹

2. All the ministers who desire to do so to receive episcopal ordi-

¹ The position of the bishops of the Order would be very similar to that of the mitred abbots of the pre-Reformation Church.—(Note by Mr. Mowbray.)

nation (making the usual subscription to the Articles, &c.), those in full connection at once, and those on probation at the expiration of the usual probationary period. Ministers in full connexion not to be required to pass any theological or educational examination, and to be admitted to priests' orders as soon after receiving the Diaconate as possible.

3. The stationing of the ministers, the management of the finances, and the general work of the Order to be under the direction of the Conference, as at present; but the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation to be represented in the Conference.

4. The bishops and clergy of the Order to be under no disability as regards ecclesiastical preferment by reason of their connection with the Order.

5. The connexional property to be vested in trustees, one-half in number to be nominated by Convocation, and the remainder by the Conference, upon trust for the benefit of the Order as a religious community in full communion with the Church, but not to be sold or put to any secular use.

6. The Order to be, as far as practicable, self-supporting as at present, but to receive pecuniary, as indeed every other kind of help, from the Church generally, whenever required, rendering the same in return whenever necessity may arise.

7. The Church's Creeds (as they are appointed to be said) to be recited once every Sunday in all the churches of the Order; the Church's offices for Baptism and Holy Communion to be adopted; and the Holy Eucharist to be celebrated, wherever practicable, weekly, according to the custom of the Early Church. In all other respects the congregations of the Order to be under no restriction whatever as to the use of liturgical forms. Lay preaching and all other distinctive usages of Methodism to be retained.

Mr. Mowbray considers that "the position assigned to Methodism" in this "scheme," "is that which Wesley designed that it should occupy—namely, an Order in full communion with the Church." Mr. Borradaile's "scheme" is less minute.¹ The chief difference

¹ 1. That the Wesleyan Connexion should be a Home Mission Society within the Church of England; employing its own agents, and regulating its own affairs. 2. That the constitution of the Society should remain in its present condition. 3. That all regular ministers with care of souls should be admitted to the priesthood by episcopal ordination. 4. That all chapels capable of supporting a resident minister should be opened under episcopal license as chapels-of-ease to the parish church. 5. That local preachers and those who wish to retain their secular employment should be admitted into the Diaconate by episcopal ordination and licensed to preach. 6. That the smaller meeting-houses that are not able to support a resident minister should be opened under episcopal license for prayer meetings, preaching, &c., but not for the administration of the sacraments. 7. That all internal arrangements of the Society, appointment and dismissal of ministers, &c., shall, as heretofore, be under the control of the President and Conference. 8. That the bishop of the diocese shall have the same canonical control over the priests and deacons who are members of the Wesleyan connection as he possesses over the rest of the clergy of his diocese.

between the two "schemes," however, is that Mr. Mowbray's contemplates the elevation of three or four Wesleyan ministers to the episcopate for the purpose of re-ordaining their brethren and exercising episcopal supervision over the "Order" (or Connexion generally)—which seems a judicious suggestion; while Mr. Borradaile's omits this courteous preliminary. On the other hand, however, Mr. Mowbray proposes to give Convocation a *locus standi* in connection with the Wesleyan Conference, while Mr. Borradaile judiciously leaves the Conference unfettered. With regard to Mr. Mowbray's suggestion that the Wesleyan bishops should act as suffragans of the bishops of the Church of England in whose dioceses they reside, I do not think that much difficulty would arise. The Rev. Dr. Rule, the eminent Wesleyan Minister, once informed me that the Wesleyans paid the Church of England the compliment of not appointing diocesan bishops in this country, because they regarded the diocesan bishops of the Church of England as, in some sense, *their* bishops. The Wesleyans, he said, were content with the uneclesiastical name of "district chairman" instead of "diocesan bishop" for the same courteous reason. Mr. Borradaile's suggestions for turning "local preachers" into "lay deacons" and Wesleyan chapels into chapels-of-ease, possess at least the merit of ingenuity. I do not quite see, on the other hand, that Churchmen would be justified in imposing on Wesleyan Methodists the condition suggested by Mr. Mowbray, of celebrating, wherever practicable, the Holy Eucharist weekly. Should any variation in the trusts upon which the property of the Wesleyan Connexion is held be necessary, Mr. Mowbray thinks this could be effected through the medium of the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice. If legislative action is necessary, a precedent, Mr. Mowbray points out, will be found in "The Primitive Methodist Society of Ireland Act, 1871" (34 & 35 Vict. c. 40), which was passed for the purpose of uniting the Primitive Methodists of Ireland with the Church of Ireland. It is a remarkable fact that Mr. Mowbray, who is evidently an extreme High Churchman, declares his belief that "Wesleyan ministers, preaching in our churches, could be thoroughly trusted as regards the orthodoxy of their teaching," and that Mr. Borradaile, "Curate of S. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square," expresses a decided opinion that "the chief difficulties in the way of the reabsorption of the Wesleyan Connexion into the Church of England would be in the matter of organization rather than of doctrine." When such language can be used by men who are tinged with Sacramentalism and Sacerdotalism, ought not the Evangelical party in the Church of England to entertain sanguine views respecting the possibilities of corporate reunion?

Bishop Ryle, however, at the Leicester Church Congress, declared emphatically that "we must not waste time and energy on the pleasant, but Quixotic idea, that we can ever bring about a wholesale reunion of Church and Dissent." A *wholesale* reunion, I grant, but a reunion of *orthodox* Dissenters with the Church, I hold, with deep submission, it is the duty of every Evangelical Churchman to earnestly work and fervently pray for.

If the concessions were to be all on one side—the side of the orthodox Nonconformists, I could quite understand the schism between them and the Church remaining unhealed; but if Churchmen are really in earnest in this matter, they must be prepared to meet the orthodox Nonconformists half-way—there must be mutual concession.¹

The experience of the fate of the sister Church of Ireland ought to carry conviction to our minds that neither the Sovereign nor the House of Lords can or will save the Church of England from disestablishment and disendowment, if once a decisive majority favourable to her severance from the State, and "liberation" from her property, is secured in the House of Commons. I cannot conceive of anything more likely to avert the overthrow of the Established Church, than judicious "Comprehension" of the orthodox Dissenters. And surely for such an object—the maintenance of our beloved Church, as the National Church—all "schools of thought" within her pale should be prepared to make some concessions.

It is a remarkable fact that never was there so hearty a co-operation as there is now between Churchmen and Nonconformists in the council-chambers of religious societies. I have had the honour of a seat at the Council-board of the Religious Tract Society, composed, in equal moieties, of Churchmen and Nonconformists, clerical and lay, and I can from my heart declare that, while the utmost freedom of *criticism* was allowed, and indeed encouraged, no single word of *controversy* arose during my term of office. On doctrinal questions there was the most absolute identity of sentiment, and questions of forms of Church government were never introduced. On the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which is, I believe, composed also of Churchmen and Nonconformists in equal moieties, the

¹ One of the most hopeful "signs of the times" is the disposition of Churchmen of eminence to regard Nonconformists with yearning sympathy, instead of looking down upon them with lofty contempt and scorn as "mere Dissenters." History teaches us that the authors of modern Dissent were driven out of the Church of England by the apathy, worldliness, and intolerance of past generations of Churchmen, and it is right that the initial words of Churchmen in mixed assemblies of Churchmen and Nonconformists should be words of humility and self-abasement.

same harmony, I understand, prevails. The Committee of the London City Mission is composed also of Churchmen and Nonconformists in similiar proportions, and similiar concord exists upon it. Churchmen and Nonconformists unite on the Committees of the Christian Evidence Society, of the Young Men's Christian Association, of Ragged Schools, of Reformatories, of Refuges. On all these executive bodies, actively engaged as they are in propagating the Christian faith, "our *common* Christianity" is not a name only, but a deep and abiding reality. Eminent Nonconformists acquire, from contact and co-operation with Churchmen on these executive bodies, a habit of dwelling on the points on which Churchmen and they agree, rather than on the points on which Churchmen and they differ. There is, at the same time, from intimate social intercourse, a softening of that asperity, the offspring of social jealousy, which is so uninviting a characteristic of the Dissenting mind, and which is the mainspring of the movement for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church.

I thoroughly agree with Bishop Ryle's statement at the Leicester Church Congress, that "if we would improve the relations of Church and Dissent, we ought to co-operate with Dissenters whenever we can." "It is vain," he said, "to deny that there is much common ground on which we can work together without the slightest compromise of principle, and I contend that we ought to be always ready to occupy that ground in a brotherly spirit, and not to stand aloof, and turn the cold shoulder on possible allies. The great controversy with infidelity, the cause of scriptural education, the maintenance of Sunday, the improvements of the dwellings of the poor, the grand temperance movement, the translation and circulation of the Bible—all these are points about which I advise every Churchman to work with Dissenters whenever he can. I for one rejoice heartily in the constitution of the Committee for the Revision of the Authorized Version of the Scriptures. That Committee contains not a few Dissenters as well as Churchmen. I thank God for it. . . . It has proved one thing. It has proved most assuredly that Churchmen and Dissenters can work together and respect one another. I grant that this is not union, but it is a long step toward it."

"I think, my lord," said Mr. Clarke, a Congregational minister, addressing Earl Nelson, the Chairman, at a Home Reunion Conference, "you would be surprised to learn in how many hundreds of Nonconformist chapels last Sunday the Psalms of David were chanted, the *Te Deum* sung, the Lord's Prayer repeated; in how many prayers passages from the Liturgy were interwoven; in how many Nonconformist places of worship the Liturgy itself, slightly altered, was used. . . . Substan-

tially, we hold the three Creeds. . . . We have thought it well to build more ornate and elegant places of worship."

As the *Times*¹ has pointed out, "whether inside or outside, you cannot even tell, without looking closely, whether it is a 'church' or a 'chapel.' The spires rise as high, the window tracery is as fanciful, the portals are as lofty and as deeply recessed."

Mr. Clarke observed that "The spirit, the animus—shall I say the demon?—of denominationalism is disappearing."

What a brilliant illustration of this was afforded by the address of the Leicester Nonconformist ministers to the Leicester Church Congress! The address, though local, was national in its tone. It seems like a rainbow of promise spanning this England of ours from sea to sea and re-uniting its people, after centuries of religious discord, in the sweetest of bonds—"the bond of peace:"—

We desire to acknowledge our obligation to you, as representing the Church of England, for the healthy stimulus we have received from the lives of your many saints, confessors, and worthies. The illustrious names of Herbert and Ken, Leighton and Wilson, are as dear to us as to yourselves. Nor are we less indebted to your scholars, your theologians, your masters of sentences, for a vast and instructive literature, for a thousand contributions to a right study of the Bible, and a clear apprehension of Christian truth. The works of Hooker and Jeremy Taylor, of Pearson and Milman, of Lightfoot and Westcott, are all the delight and possession of the Nonconformist ministry as well as of your own. If our forms of worship vary from yours, yet your noble liturgy, enriched by the persistence, the trust, the sorrow, and the gladness of the saints of many ages, is for us, no less than for others, a priceless treasure of devotion. Scarcely ever do we come together to give thanks for the divine goodness without using those hymns which the singers of your Church have given the world, and side by side with Wesley, Watts, and Doddridge we place the solemn and beautiful melodies of Heber, Lyte, and Keble. Your eloquent preachers, your seraphic doctors, your saintly examples have laid us under an immense obligation which we can never repay, and which we confess by uniting with them as we hear their voices calling us in the services of our Lord and Master.

Dec. 1880.

WILLIAM T. CHARLEY.

ART. V.—EMINENT STATESMEN AND WRITERS.²

MR. HAYWARD is certainly one of the most accomplished of our modern essayists. In his works he revives a style of composition which the book-making and hasty conclusions of

¹ September 23, 1880.

² "Sketches of Eminent Statesmen and Writers." By A. Hayward, Q.C. Two volumes. John Murray.