

in all ages, is the remedy for the many evils of our own time, *e.g.*, with reference to the question of capital and labour, master and servant, class and class. The duty of the Church to see to it that men learn the truth that all gifts are for "the body"—not for the individual. ii. Exaggerations of Articles of the Faith to the damage of the proportion of Truth to be avoided. The cause of division in the Church, this neglect of the symmetry of Gospel truth. iii. Business need not mean real work done. We should take care to be usefully busy. To be restlessly on the move an affectation of the day. Sometimes there is strength in "sitting still." Is. 30-15. "In quietness and confidence shall be your strength," St. Luke x, 42. iv. All these are small things, but they enter into the very fibre and structure of the Christian character. To attend to details, to simple rules, to what the world calls "minor" matters, *e.g.*, the solidarity of the Church, the proportion of things in religious teaching, the necessity of doing carefully *whatever* God gives us to do, being useful as well as busy; a kindly sympathy with the joys or sorrows of others. These are not "high things;" they are hidden out of sight of men, but they are the foundations upon which is to be built up the image of God in the soul of man, which, after Christ, is created in righteousness and true holiness.

ANGLO-CATHOLIC COMPREHENSIVENESS AS A BASIS OF CHURCH UNITY.

The foundation of Church Unity must be both *deep* and *broad*. It must rest for its validity and authority on the bed-rock of primitive Catholicity; it must be large enough to underlie every wall and column and 'lively stone' which the Master would build up into His 'Spiritual House.'

The first requirement of unity is the Catholic, Apostolic, Divine authority, which comes of corporate continuity with the primitive Church; not an *imitation* or a *reproduction*, but an *organic*, *identical* perpetuation of the Apostolic Fellowship—the Faith, the Sacraments, the Order, and devotional system of the early Church. Without this there may be an amalgamation of sects, a platform of opinions, but not *Church Unity*.

Let no one make light of the corporate continuity of the Kingdom of God. More than three-fourths of Christendom to-day prizes its organic connexion with the early Church, believing (and rightly) that *men* can no more make a new Church than they can create a new world. No basis of unity will be firm enough to support more than a small fragment of Christendom (*viz.*, the Dissenting Communions—nor those satisfactorily) unless it rest on the bed-rock of primitive Catholicity.

Protestant Christianity, therefore, the disconnected, unhistoric, voluntary, social, unauthoritative, non-sacramental system of religion, can never be the basis of Church Unity. *It has no depth.*

Historic Christendom, by which is meant that part of the Christian world which retains the Ministry, the Creeds, the Sacraments, the Worship, and the Traditions of the Apostolic Church, certainly cannot be left out of any scheme for Church Unity. It must, however, be confessed that a large part of Historic Christendom (the *Latin* part) is now estranged from Protestant Christendom, not by reason of its *Catholic* inheritance, but by reason of certain *un-Catholic* innovations or 'developments,' which (whether desirable or not) are by no means *essential*, for they were not required or even known in the early Church. Greek and Anglican Catholics and Protestants (a majority of all Christians), can never be brought to accept the

novelties any more than Greek, Anglican, and Roman Catholics (a still larger majority of all Christians), can ever be brought to exchange their common and truly Catholic inheritance for the anti-Catholic principles of unhistoric or Protestant Christianity. The basis of Christian unity, then, must be broad enough to include those who do not accept the distinctively Latin innovations; broad enough to allow of the principle of reformation.

Latin Catholicism, therefore, as at present narrowed by new dogmas and 'developments,' cannot be a successful basis of Church unity. *It is not broad enough.*

We have now seen that Protestantism, as having no connexion with the early Church, and *Latin* Catholicism, as narrowed by Trent and the Vatican, cannot be the basis of unity. The former is not *deep* enough; the latter is not *broad* enough.

What, then, is wanted? I answer, *Liberal Catholicism*—a Christianity at once Apostolic and free, ecclesiastical and scriptural, historic and reformed, deep and broad; in a word, *Comprehensive*. In all charity and common sense I submit, is not this the ideal basis of unity?

There is in the providence of God a large and important part of Christendom, not sufficiently understood, which comes nearer this ideal than any other portion of the Universal Church. I mean, the Historic Mother Church of the English-speaking race. It is Catholic in all essentials; its roots are in the Past. It has retained the Apostolic Fellowship, as seen in the unbroken succession of its Ministers, in the Orthodox Faith, the primitive Sacraments, and a Catholic Liturgy. It is as liberal as the Gospel, simple in its terms of membership, demanding no baptismal profession but the Creed of the Blessed Apostles, and in the christening using either immersion or affusion; recognising all baptisms in Christendom, whether ecclesiastical or non-conforming, whether by priest or layman, if only done with water in the Name of the Blessed Trinity; allowing, over and above the prescribed offices, perfect liberty of worship, and in the prescribed offices great variety of ritual; giving the laity all the privilege of their order, and opportunity for all the work they can reasonably perform,—in short, conservative and progressive, holding to the past and adapting itself to the present; rich in its history and traditions, its missionary activity, its piety, prestige, and power; renowned for its charities, learning, literature, and art; historic and reformed, Catholic and liberal, with its 225 bishops, its 30,000 priests, and its 25,000,000 adherents—the dominant religion of the dominant race of the world. As a profound thinker has lately observed: 'There is nothing arrogant in saying that the Church of England is just the one body on earth which can provide a way of escape for both (extremes), enabling the Protestant to get back the ancient Creeds and Hierarchy, the stately worship, and the consecration of art and emotion, without the top hamper of novel cults and questionable miracles; enabling the Roman Catholic to get rid of those parts of his system which revolt his intellect and conscience, without having to throw away therewith the golden deposit of primitive Catholicism.'

If no such Church as the Anglican were in existence to-day, I verily believe the *ideal basis of unity* which all thoughtful Christians must seek, would be substantially that of the Anglo-Catholic Church. What shall I say? Is the actual existence of such a comprehensive historic Church—so providentially fitted to be the nucleus and working centre of Church unity—an actual hindrance to Church unity? Shall the *ideal basis of unity*, which unity-loving Christians would agonise to create if it did not exist, be cast aside, through inherited jealousy and denominational pride, simply because it *does* exist, right to hand. God forbid!

To sum up what has been written. The

basis of Church unity must be deep and broad. Romanism is deep but not broad. Protestantism is broad but not deep. The Anglo-Catholic Church is both deep and broad—reformed, indeed, but Catholic still; and as such it offers, if not the only, at least the most reasonable and practical foundation for the reunion of Christendom. If there be a better one, what is it?

To some it may be a new idea that the Anglican Church is the only living exponent of *Liberal Catholicism*, and some will say, 'If such is really the case, we want to be convinced of it.' Well, all I ask of you is, for the sake of Church unity, *examine the case*. If you find a deeper and broader foundation of Church unity, build upon it; if not, your duty is clear.

I close this brief paper with the words of two unity-loving Christians, as widely severed as any who love the Lord Jesus Christ can possibly be. On the one hand Ultramontano De Maistre, after a residence in Russia had shown him the possibility of the Catholic religion without the Roman encumbrances, left it on record: 'If Christians ever come together again, as they all desire, it is evident that the movement must originate with the English Church.' While, on the other hand, the Presbyterian Dr. Shields has recently said, that if the reunion of American Christianity ever comes, 'it must come through the spirit of *Protestant Catholicism*, of which the English Liturgy, properly amended and enriched, would be the best conceivable embodiment.' ARTHUR WILDE LITTLE.

Contemporary Church Opinion.

Living Church (Chicago):

The "developments" of material science are truly wonderful. The way that it demonstrates the antiquity of man is surprising. The famous Calaveras skull, which was taken from a tunnel under Table Mountain some years ago, was proof positive that man existed before the present geological epoch. Genesis was a myth! Unfortunately for the "pre-historic man," however, Dr. Southall, in his "Recent Origin of Man," tells us that a Mr. Brier, a miner, whose brother was a reliable minister of Alvarado, California, was one of the two men who took the skull from a cave in the sides of the valley, and placed it in the shaft, where it was found; and that the whole object was a practical joke, to deceive Prof. Whitney, the geologist.

It is not many years since clergymen of spotless life and undeniable earnestness were being imprisoned in enlightened England, for using certain ornaments and ceremonial in divine service, which appeared to be sanctioned or enjoined by law and rubric. It makes one wonder to read that without the slightest change in the law or the enactment of any additional statutes, penalties are now inflicted upon those who undertake to remove the very ornaments which so short a time ago it was an offence to retain. In a recent case, the Rev. Arthur Keble White, of Burley parish church, in the diocese of Winchester, prayed that the churchwardens should be required to replace at once on the retable of the altar, a brass cross, candlesticks, candelabra, and vases, which they had taken the liberty of removing. The chancellor of the diocese before whom the case was tried, condemned the churchwardens in costs and ordered them to replace the articles within eight days. Verily the tables seem to be turned! It is strange, too, what can have become of the "aggrieved parishioner," whose complaints were always received with such solemnity, though he might really live in Egypt and never darken the doors of the parish church!