

TRUE PHILANTHROPY.

One of the distinguishing efforts of some literary men in the last century was the attempt to give a new and special prominence to a virtue, which was treated almost as if it had been a new manufacture or discovery—the virtue of philanthropy. And two singular mistakes were made about it. Philanthropy was assumed to have reference only to the external and earthly life of man, and it was regarded as a virtue which had been created by modern philosophy. Now, if anything is historically certain, it is certain that philosophy—which from time to time has said very fine things about our duties to each other within certain limits—never created any such virtue among the people as philanthropy. Philanthropy was created at the foot of the Cross of Christ, and then it was patronized by the eighteenth century philosophy. And this mistake about the origin of philanthropy was only less considerable than the other mistake about its true range of operations. What is philanthropy but the love of man? Is that a true love of man which loves only his body and not his soul? Has philanthropy done its all, or its best, when it has built hospitals, when it has organized the relief of the poor, when it has advocated secular education, when it has generally promoted the temporal well-being of people? How can such-like efforts exhaust the duties of philanthropy, unless, indeed, man be only a body, with perhaps, an added endowment of transient and perishing intelligence, unless his body be the central seat of his life, the only feature of his being whereof a true love of him need take serious account? Has philanthropy then nothing to say to the true indestructible man, to the being who lives within and beyond the senses, to the being who still lives when disease has done its worst, and when the coffin has been nailed down? Surely a philanthropy that would deserve the name cannot thus exclude from its purview the most intimate essence, the true being, the higher nature of man, his undying personality, his soul. Certainly, He Who loved man better than any other, the Divine Philanthropist, He did not do so. If he fed the hungry, He also bade men “labour not for the meat that perisheth, but for that which endureth to everlasting life.” If He healed the sick, He told men of those worse diseases of the soul which He also, and He alone, could heal. He told them of a life which would last when that which His wonder-working touch had invigorated should have passed away. No doubt, my brethren, if there were no hereafter, if all really ended at death, there would be reason in confining ourselves to provisions for the needs, and to relieving the wants of this present life; it would be folly to spend time and money on unsubstantial creations of fancy. They who deny the life after death are quite consistent in resenting the supreme importance which we Christians attach to preparation for it, but for any Christian who says, with the Apostle, “we look not to the things which are seen, but to the things which are not seen, for the things that are seen are temporal, but the things that are not seen are eternal,” it must be clear that a true philanthropy must devote its highest and most strenuous efforts to the soul of man, to its enlightenment by the knowledge of God, to its expansion through the love of God, to its elevation, to its invigoration through conformity to the will of God. And how is this possible without the knowledge and love of Him Who has bridged over the gulf that separated man from God, “the one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus,”—how is it possible without the Divine Guide Who has dared to say, “I am the way, the truth, and

the life, no man cometh unto the Father but by me,”—how is it possible, apart from His faith, His Word, His Church, His sacraments, if His apostle is right in saying that “neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name given among men under Heaven whereby we may be saved”?—*Canon Liddon.*

CHURCHMANSHIP.

When “Church Unity” is spoken of, many people understand that by that term is meant a retreating from the historic position of our Church, a breaking down of the principles which she has always cherished, and in general, a degraded idea of churchmanship. It is needless to say that such is a misconception. The very strength which comes from the consciousness of a security of position is the power which makes it possible for our Church to take initiatory steps towards unity. If we were not sure of the validity of the orders of our ministry, coming in unbroken succession from the early Church, we might hold ourselves in fear aloof from religious bodies. But such narrow exclusiveness could not strengthen a doubtful position, even though it might give a sort of selfish satisfaction, and with consciousness of strength it is needless. There is a word which we hold as dear in our creeds, and of which we profess to have a large understanding—the word *catholic*. On the ground of true catholicity, we can indeed pray that “all who profess and call themselves Christians, may * * * hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life.” As one of the Church papers has recently well said, it is only taste, not principle, which a churchman has to sacrifice in making practical advances towards Christian unity; and in making these advances we may feel sure that with the precious possession of the Book of Common Prayer, we are in no peril of falling into any unorthodox ways of worship; and with the greater value we attach to a sacrament administered by priests in the order of succession, we need not apprehend falling into any debased conception of these ordinances. The feeling of strong churchmanship—trust in the authority of the ordinances of the Church—is the very thing which enables churchmen to go farther than others in the search for unity, and to give up those things which are merely matters of taste, that our catholicity may become stronger and purer.—*Rev. F. Mc. Foster, in Parish Magazine.*

SOME CONUNDRUMS.

Why is it that good Churchmen find it so easy to give from three to five hours to an entertainment or social gathering for their personal gratification, and are in such a hurry when asked to attend meetings of the vestry or committees, occasionally, to transact the important work of the Lord?

Why does ten dollars seem so large when asked for church purposes, and so small when it is to be expended on personal indulgence?

Why is time so scarce when the church-bell calls to worship, but so plenty when the world calls for pleasure?

Why are Sundays and other church days colder, and hotter, and wetter than other days?

Why do people who seldom, or never, respond to special calls for money, find most fault because the calls are made?

Why is Sunday sickness the sickest sickness?

Why are excuses that will keep people from church not thought sufficient for “regrets” when social requisitions are made?

Why is not the salvation of the soul made the first consideration at all times?—*North East, Maine.*

WHY DID YOU LEAVE THE WESLEYANS AND JOIN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND?

(S.P.C.K. Tract No. 1592.)

JOHN WESLEY'S REASONS AGAINST A SEPARATION FROM THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.—(Continued.)

[10.] Because the experiment has been so frequently tried already, and the success never answered the expectation. God has since the Reformation raised up from time to time many witnesses of pure religion. If these lived and died (like John Arndt, Robert Bolton, and many others) in the churches to which they belonged, notwithstanding the wickedness which overflowed both the Teachers and people therein, they spread the leaven of true religion far and wide, and were more and more useful, till they went to paradise. But if, upon any provocation or consideration whatever, they separated, and founded distinct parties, their influence was more and more confined; they grew less and less useful to others, and generally lost the spirit of religion themselves in the spirit of controversy.

[11.] Because we have melancholy instances of this, even now before our eyes. Many have in our memory left the Church, and formed themselves into distinct bodies. And certainly some of them from a real persuasion that they should do God more service. But have any separated themselves and prospered? Have they been either more holy, or more useful, than they were before?

[12.] Because by such a separation we should not only throw away the peculiar glorying which God has given us, that we do and will suffer all things for our brethren's sake, though the more we love them, the less we be loved; but should act in direct contradiction to that very end for which we believe God hath raised us up. The chief design of His providence in sending us out is, undoubtedly, to quicken our brethren. And the first message of all our Preachers is to the lost sheep of the Church of England. Now, would it not be a flat contradiction to this design, to separate from the Church? These things being considered, we cannot apprehend (whether it be lawful in itself or no) that it is lawful for us; were it only on this ground, that it is by no means expedient.

2. It has indeed been objected, that till we do separate, we cannot be a compact, united body.

It is true, we cannot till then be “a compact united body,” if you mean by that expression, a body distinct from all others. And we have no desire so to be.

It has been objected, secondly, “It is mere cowardice and fear of persecution which makes you desire to remain united with them.”

This cannot be proved. Let every one examine his own heart, and not judge his brother.

It is not probable. We never yet for any persecution, when we were in the midst of it, either turned back from the work or even slackened our pace.

But this is certain; that although persecution many times proves an unspeakable blessing to them that suffer it, yet we ought not wilfully to bring it upon ourselves. Nay, we ought to do whatever can lawfully be done in order to prevent it. We ought to avoid it so far as we lawfully can; when persecuted in one city to flee into another. If God should suffer a general persecution, who would be able to abide it we know not. Perhaps those who talk loudest might flee first. Remember the case of Dr. Pendleton.