

Israelite. Among other things, they taught that, "If the disciple of a wise man be despised or reviled by any man publicly, it is unlawful to forgive any affront to his honor; and if he forgive, he is to be punished." But when Christ came He taught, "Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven;" "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you." He Himself gave the most magnificent illustration of His teaching when He exclaimed on the cross, "Father, forgive them: they know not what they do." And His followers, in propagating His religion, dwelt especially on the same principle, when they taught, "See that none render evil for evil unto any man;" "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink;" "The Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men." All this is just as much opposed to Jewish notions as it is to the modern idea of progress, which is practically exemplified in every man taking care of himself.

#### THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY AND AGNOSTICISM.

THE Archbishop has been giving additional portions of his charge, in which he has made some further allusions to the Burials Act, in endeavoring to persuade the clergy that they have been relieved from a multitude of disabilities and hardships to which they had been exposed; but His Grace failed to show how the clergy had been relieved from the particular disability they had complained of, namely, the being obliged to bury people who have not died in the faith of the Church, or who have lived ungodly lives, or perhaps have really died in the commission of actual sin. This was the great grievance of the clergy—they being obliged to read the pious and laudatory service of the Church as we find it in the Book of Common Prayer over notoriously wicked characters. But the real fact of the case is that the Burial Act does not relieve the clergy at all in this respect, and the Archbishop must be as well aware of this fact as any one else.

The Archbishop has dwelt, in the third and fourth portions of his charge, chiefly upon the subject of "Infidelity." And in the first part of his indictment he refers to Agnosticism, which is only another name for Atheism. Atheism means the negation of a God. Agnosticism means the negation of everything, the knowing of nothing. And, although the Archbishop has not, in the estimation of many people, touched the exact point of the evil which is the characteristic feature of the present day, yet his remarks are of considerable value. He says:—"An Agnostic is one who says, I know nothing about all things spiritual or metaphysical. You tell me there is a world beyond the grave, and that there is something within me destined to live in the world when all the material objects, of whose existence alone I can be certain, have crumbled into dust. You tell me old stories of men believing that they had intercourse, in time past, with a spiritual Being Who dwells somewhere above the clouds. I know nothing which is capable of corroborating such fancies; and, therefore, why should I not regard them as the dreams of a heated imagination? I want something certain, and they say I find this certainty only in the physical phenomena around me. To this kind of argument the Archbishop would object:—"Do you believe nothing which is not capable of being tested by the ordinary rules which govern experiments in things material? How do you know that you yourselves exist? How do you know that the perceptions of yourselves are not mere delusions? Had they a mind, or had

they not? What was it that enabled them to think, to reason, to fear, and to hope? They must admit that intellect was almost Divine, if there was anything Divine, and he thought they must allow that it was not a thing to be propagated as they propagated well-made and high-bred cattle. Whence came Alexander the Great and Charlemagne? Whence came the first Napoleon? Was it through some process of spontaneous generation that they sprang up to alter, by their overwhelming will, the destinies of the world? Again, whence came Homer, Shakespeare, Bacon, and all the great historians; Plato, and all the bright lights of divinity, philosophy, oratory and poetry?.....Or he might descend to the ground of strict logic, and challenge these men to give an intelligible account of how this bright world, and all that lived in it, came into existence without the action of a great first Cause—that is, a God. No one had ever yet been able to refute the old argument necessitating a great first Cause; and if there was such a Cause, this Cause was the Author of our being. And God, being the Creator of the world once, must, if there be any meaning in the terms by which we strove to express its existence, be ever Lord of it. In all consistency a man of science, who was guided by real facts, must allow that any man who had a mind as well as a body, at however great a distance that mind might be placed from its original, must have something within it, akin to the mind, by which it was generated, and must be more like an eternal mind than a body.

The Archbishop's remarks are generally regarded as pointing to an older phase of unbelief than that now so rife in the world; and, while acknowledging the force of the Most Reverend Prelate's remark that superstition is no cure for unbelief, it is urged that the new Theism is not precisely the same thing as the old Deism revived, otherwise it could be met by the arguments of Bishop Butler and other great writers of the eighteenth century. And that if any one can be found to profess himself an Atheist, and to contend that the universe came by chance, he might be left to the old arguments of Paley. The old arguments against Deism are still unanswerable. The Deistic Theory is that there is a God Who made all things, and then retired from the work of His own hands. But if there is anything that it is possible to say Omnipotence cannot do, it is to withdraw from His own creation. It is easy to talk about "laws." But a law, without some power to execute it, is a nullity; and to say that God has made a law simply means that He has a habit of acting in a certain way. And this remark will apply to a great deal of trash that is talked about "Development." If by development is meant that it is not God who has made plants and animals, but they themselves, it is not possible to imagine a greater absurdity. But if by development it is meant that God has chosen to work gradually, then there is much in the Christian faith, in the Biblical record, and in all experience to support the hypothesis. What the Evolutionists have yet to do is to prove their hypothesis: and then they will have promulgated a new and, perhaps, a magnificent commentary on the first article of the Creed, not a refutation of it.

The present state of the case has been put in this way. The Theist believes that God was, and is; that He created the world and governs it; that he has a permanent and vital relation to His creatures, and may suspend and modify His laws at pleasure. But, instead of accepting what Christians mean by Revelation, he puts forward his own notions as to what God wills. He thinks that God

has always revealed Himself in progressive steps and continues to do so still; and that we may look forward to many a step beyond the conceptions of the Gospel. There is a vast amount of this system in the present among us; and it is intimated that the Archbishop has not offered his clergy any suggestions as to the best mode of dealing with the delusion. It is, therefore, urged that what is wanted, but what the Archbishop has not given us, is a clear and readable statement of what non-Christian Humanitarianism has ever done for humanity; and that such a statement would show how utterly hopeless it is to look for any amelioration of the plague spots of our civilization in any form of secularistic philosophy or morality.

#### PORTRAIT GALLERY OF CHURCHMEN.

No. 1.

A VICAR IN IVANHOE LAND.

IN glancing over past years, there comes across the field of vision, like the spectres conjured up before Macbeth, a procession of personal memories of Churchmen with whom, in days gone by, we had intercourse more or less familiar. Some of these have joined the "Church at rest;" the images of others "rise like spirits, so depart" who yet "their watch are keeping" on the ramparts, or fighting Zion's battle on the plain.

Personal portraiture, while one of the most fascinating forms of literature, is one of the most difficult branches of literary work. We pretend not to have skill in this, but propose simply to hold up a mirror in which will be reflected those images which are now pictured in our memory.

Our first introduction to a clergyman was under circumstances not favorable for close observation, as we then had only a few days experience of the world, the baptismal water, too, was very cold and the parson more like a wolf than a shepherd.

Although brought up under the shadow of the Church, only a stone's throw from the vicarage, and there resident till manhood, we do not remember ever to have been spoken to by the Vicar who signed us with the baptismal cross. Yet our family was, in a sense, very strictly "Church," but save on Archdiaconal visiting days, or Confirmation, or the very rare occasion of a sermon by a stranger, we were very seldom taken to service, as a chronic feud existed between the Vicar and well nigh every family in the parish. The church, one of the noblest parish churches in the world, was deserted, save by a handful of people, chiefly officials, as the families of the wardens, clerk, sexton and beadle made up the bulk of the congregation. The Vicar was a tall, beetle-browed, cadaverous visaged man with the bearing and gait of a tenth rate tragedian. He trod the village with tilted chin and supercilious pucker of his pinched lips, indifferent to all that was passing near, deigning not to notice, by nod or smile, any of his flock. This proud unconcern was manifest also when fulfilling his offices in the church. The service was a mumbled duet between himself and the clerk, whom we boys irreverently called "Old Billy." The Vicar read the prayers with the expression of one who was doing the Almighty too much honor in addressing Him, and therefore was under restraint, lest liberties should be taken by the Divine Being with so very distinguished a suppliant. The clerks said his *Amen* with a tremulous vibration upon the *A*, like the bleating of a sheep, and dropped suddenly on the final syllable "men" as though he suddenly remembered that this was necessary to finish his response. We say "his response," for the notion than any