

all endowed clergy take warning, this authority declares that endowments have the miraculous power of paralyzing the brains and consciences of all their unfortunate recipients. If however, we see any sign of a clergyman piling up a fortune out of his endowment income, we shall not shrink from proclaiming that he has been demoralized by this assistance. But we know that "at home" there are hundreds of clergy, the most devoted in the world, martyrs to duty, who have not one penny to live upon save an endowment. Let our contemporary travel a little, his horizon is too narrow, his experience too scanty, his reading of Church history so woefully shallow, that in matters of this kind he is incapable of giving an opinion worth listening to. He would serve his party better by retiring "beyond Jordan" for a season, until he becomes competent by prolonged study to deal intelligently with the affairs of the Church of England. Besides learning that mental and moral paralysis are not the natural effects of an endowment, he would discover that a clergyman is not necessarily provided with all the gifts and graces needful for his office by being dependent for a living on his flock, as he now believes, *ie.*, if his words have any logical coherence. Was St. Paul dependent on the people? Did he not work with his hands in order to be independent? According to our contemporary the only true source of authority to minister in the congregation, and the richest fountain of clerical wisdom and power is the popular voice. What a pity it seems to waste time in educating candidates for the ministry who might acquire all they need at a vestry meeting manipulated by party agents, and who, alas! after making efficient pastors are liable to be made suddenly incompetent by entering an endowed parish

THE LIMITS OF THE VISIBLE CHURCH.

WE hope still earnestly that neither from the Archdeacon of Westminster nor from the Dean of Lincoln, who was, we fear, the first offender in this respect, shall we hear anything more about "unchurching the Presbyterians" or any one else. The verb *to unchurch* has every vice a word can have. It is ugly, modern, vague, misleading, and irritating. In the only sense which by any rules of formation it could have it would be applicable to one sex alone. For there is but one meaning in which the English language recognizes the original verb *to church*; and it is a meaning wholly unsuitable to Presbyterians at large.

Surely it would be far better and more hopeful if, instead of either using or abusing this clumsy and uncomely phrase, Churchmen would try to think whether there is such an act or state as schism; whether it is to be regarded (subject to ample allowance for all qualifying and extenuating circumstances) as sinful; what are its distinctions from heresy and apostasy; and what are its effects upon the position and privileges which are conferred

by baptism. There appeared at times in the recent discussions of Convocation a curious inability to see the difference between the conditions of the Church's corporate, and continuous life, and the conditions of an individual's sharing, more or less fully, the blessings which, from the central mass, flow far and wide, more or less realised, less or more hindered. Hooker would undoubtedly and truly have said, had he been present at the recent sessions of the Lower House—"For lack of diligent observing the difference, first between the Church of God mystical and visible, then between the visible sound and corrupted, sometimes more, sometimes less, the oversights are neither few nor light that have been committed," (*Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, III. i. 9). Hooker's three notes or conditions of membership in the visible Church are well known:—"We speak now of the visible Church, whose children are signed with this mark, 'One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.' In whomsoever these things are, the Church doth acknowledge them for her children; them only she holdeth for aliens and strangers in whom these things are not found," (III. i. 7). Thus Hooker would unhesitatingly have recognised as members of the Church thousands among us who reject the discipline and, in part, the doctrine of the Church of England. But he would have said that they are members of the Church in spite and not in virtue of their belonging to a schismatic community. He would have been very far from that slipshod and unscientific generosity which drains the meaning out of the Church's name by regarding it as a level and homogeneous mass, whose life and strength and glory are equally diffused throughout all its members, however they may sever or isolate themselves, however they may disown the channel through which their new birth came to them, however far they may stray from the historic and continuous tradition, lacking the valid Eucharist and the authoritative Absolution. In this matter, as in many others, Hooker sees and insists on a distinction where ordinary talk huddles things indiscriminately together. Within the vast and varied multitude who constitute the visible Church he discerns a central society, the heart of the body, as it were something which he calls "the very true Church of Christ." There is thus a distinguishing line to be drawn, or rather to be recognised, within the wide limits of the visible Church, including as it does all who have entered by the gate of baptism, and profess the faith of Christ; and on one side of the distinguishing line there may be very many grades, "degrees and differences no way possible to be drawn unto any certain account." On one side of the line are the sound members of the historic Church, those who are in full communion with her, accepting her discipline, believing all the articles of her faith, living by her rule, joining in her worship, nourished by the spiritual Food at her Altar, the Eucharist consecrated by a duly ordained priest. On the other side are those who, though still members of the Church, are in

various degrees unsound, deficient, or corrupt; some lacking more, some less of the entire privilege of Churchmen; some putting more, some less hindrance in the way of their baptismal grace. It is this conception of a partial severance and alienation, compatible with a certain share in the supernatural endowments of the Church, which seems to us to need recognition and study. To quote once more the thoughtful and precise words of Hooker:—

"That which separateth utterly, that which cutteth off clean from the visible Church of Christ is plain apostasy, direct denial, utter rejection of the whole Christian faith as far as the same is professedly different from infidelity. Heretics as touching those points of doctrine wherein they fail; schismatics as touching the quarrels for which or the duties wherein they divide themselves from their brethren; loose, licentious, and wicked persons as touching their several offences or crimes, have all forsaken the true Church of God, the Church which is sound and sincere in the doctrine that they corrupt, the Church that keepeth the bond of unity which they violate, the Church walketh in the laws of righteousness which they transgress, this very true Church of Christ they have left, howbeit not altogether left nor forsaken, simply the Church upon the main foundation whereof they continue built, notwithstanding these breaches whereby they are rent at the top asunder," (V. lxviii. 6).

We cannot help thinking that the hope of agreement as to the nature of the Church would be increased if this distinction were duly considered and borne in mind. If it be a real and valid distinction, then it would seem to set us free to insist, without fear of seeming harsh or cruel, on all the true notes of the central and historic Church, as essential to her integrity and rightful authority. It would suggest and warrant the true answer to the tenth of the proposed questions:—"Why is it our duty to belong to the Church of England?" It would make it comparatively easy to define and explain the real character and harmfulness of schism. It would make clear the true principles which should guide a parish priest in his relations with those of the flock committed to his care who are by schism hindering the energy of the grace given to them in baptism, and failing to realise the full privilege of Christianity. Above all, it would help us to discern and to teach with more distinctness what are the inherent glories, the unique prerogatives, the unfailing treasures of "this very true Church of Christ," from which the life and light have issued forth to nourish and to cheer those who for a while misunderstand its mission and reject its claims, even though the grace which through it they have by baptism received is the very power which keeps them still within the vast body of the visible church. —*The London Guardian*.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We regret that the extreme length of the letter on Education prevents its insertion. A friend has called our attention to a marriage notice announcing that the ceremony was performed by so and so, a clergyman, assisted by Mr. so and so, who is a