

who, in his factory schools at Vauxhill, has carried on the same good work with still more success, and on a larger scale, states that he undertook his noble task as a disciple of Arnold.

By men like-minded with these, the humanising influence of amusement has been brought to aid in the regeneration of the humbler classes; and religion is represented, not as sternly checking, but as sanctioning and augmenting, the pleasures of the poor. It is no slight cause of thankfulness, to hear that there are manufacturing villages in Yorkshire, where, under the superintendence of the clergyman, Handel's Messiah is performed by the operatives. Such cases are becoming daily more common; and in parishes thus administered we are sure to find the attractions of the alehouse and the ginshop, gradually superseded by those of cricket-clubs and chess clubs, reading rooms, singing classes and excursion trains.

In such measures, and generally in all the good works of the Broad Church party, two sections co-operate, which we may call, for the sake of distinctness, its theoretical and anti-theoretical sections. The opinions which we have ascribed to the party, are those of its theoretical members; and from these many of the other section would shrink with alarm. For, although they sympathise in the love of comprehension, which distinguishes their more advanced friends, yet they do not allow themselves to speculate on any relaxation of the terms of communion at present fixed by the Church. They advocate the fullest toleration of all within the pale, from Mr Gorham to Mr Bennett; the case of those without, they consider beyond their jurisdiction. This portion of the party, if less liberal than the other, is probably not less useful. By the absence of wide general views and speculative tendencies, they are less likely to provoke professional prejudice; and thus they are enabled more effectually to pursue the work of their calling, without let or hindrance.—They are characterized by cordially throwing themselves into the existing system of the Church, and casting their doctrines and their minds into the mould of her two-fold teaching. They neither stultify the Articles, nor mutilate the Liturgy; but heartily embrace the truths presented to them in each under a different aspect. They join the societies and exert themselves for the objects both of the Anglicans and the Evangelicals. They will not allow themselves to feel jealousy or suspicion towards any party which professes to fight under the banner of the Church. By this line of action, when pursued with a manly singleness of purpose, they often avoid the enmity which proverbially dogs middle courses, and sometimes even win universal popularity. No better example of such results from such conduct can be given, than the unanimous approbation elicited by the recent appointment of Dr. Jackson to the see of Lincoln.

It will appear from what we have said, that the Broad Church are, to the middle of the nineteenth century, what the Low Church were to its beginning,—the engineers of ecclesiastical reform, and the paces of moral progress. But there is one important difference between the two cases. The Evangelicals were united closely to one another, they acted as a compact body, they combined to carry common objects, and their views were advocated in Parliament by able representatives. The Catholics, on the other hand, have so little organization or mutual concert of any kind, that they can scarcely be called a party at all. They are

even destitute of that instrument, which every fractional subdivision of the smallest sects possesses, an organ in the periodical press. This is the more remarkable because among their ranks is comprehended almost every living clerical author whose name is distinguished in literature or science. There are in the present day, clergymen who have richly contributed to Classical Philology, to the Mathematical Sciences, to the Physical Sciences, to Secular History, to Ecclesiastical History, to Poetry, and to general literature. But all, with hardly a single exception, are Broad Churchmen. In theology, it is true, other parties have produced works of merit; but even there, the most valuable and original additions to the national stock have proceeded from the same quarter.—Yet this school of opinion, so rich in eminent writers, is unrepresented in the press, except by the isolated publications of individuals. The reason of this is not hard to find. It is always easier to keep together a body of partisans on a narrow than on a comprehensive basis. The watchwords of party should be battle-cries, not notes of peace. The Catholic Christian, indeed, is engaged in warfare; but it is against moral evil, not against opposing sects; his weapons are self-denial, holiness, and love, weapons less easy to wield than excommunications and interdicts. It is not difficult to raise an army for the assault of Rome, or for a crusade against Geneva; but the Flesh and the Devil are less definite antagonists; and sometimes while we think we are in arms against them, we are really fighting on their side. A common hate is the cement to consolidate a party.

The only thing which would force the Broad party into an organized alliance, would be the revival of a representative assembly of the Church. In the deliberations of such a body, they would be compelled to be a visible union, by co-operating in one line of action. Thus they would no doubt be enabled to effect more than they can at present; but, on the other hand, they could scarcely escape the vices of partizanship, from which they are now exempt.

The Catholic views of this School are assailed, as might be expected, both by High and Low. One of the favorite arguments against them, is neither more or less than the old Chrysippian sophism. 'You are willing,' says the objector, 'to include both A and B within the Church, on the ground that there is no vital difference between them. But there is as little difference between B and C, between C and D, between D and E, and so on. On your principles, then, why should you not include all the letters of the alphabet? In other words, if Dr. Pusey and Mr. Gorham are both admissible, how can you exclude the Unitarian, the Jew, the Deist, and the Pantheist?' This is easily answered by a retort; for the objector is himself willing to admit all the A's, the big A, the little A, the black-letter A, and the Italian A; and he is as unable as his antagonist to show a gulf separating the last whom he admits from the first whom he excludes.

But another and more serious objection remains. It is said that this easy comprehension leads too often to careless coldness; that universal toleration is usually associated with universal indifference. It cannot be denied that this charge contains some ground of truth. The Catholic tendency of mind has its peculiar dangers, no less than the exclusive. The Broad-Church principles have (like those of their opponents) been pushed into exaggeration, and have sunk into stagnation. Restless spirits will proceed from the negation of dogmatic in-

fallibility to Pyrrhonian scepticism. Suggestive natures will freeze without the fire of fanaticism. The natural indolence of men causes them to pass from the toleration of unimportant differences to the belief that all differences are unimportant. Thus, in the last century, the comprehensive Christianity of Tillotson and Burnet degenerated into the worldliness of Sadducean Hoadly.* And the unbelieving positiveness of the Fathers' Tavern represented the opinions of many hundreds of their brethren whose scepticism was manifested, not by public protests, but by silent neglect of their duties and selfish devotion to their interests. But though the triple subdivision may be traced in the Broad party as well as in the others, yet its debasements have this peculiarity; that its exaggerated can hardly be separated from its stagnant form. For indifference to truth naturally leads to sensualism; and the sensualist is naturally indifferent to truth. The most universal sceptic believes in pleasure; the idolator of pleasure has no faith in God.

It is true that at present the comprehensive party in the Church cannot be accused of coldness or want of energy. Arnold was no indifferentist, and his followers have been no Epicureans. Nor have these opinions been, in our own days, the stepping-stone to infidelity. On the contrary, the unbelievers of our age and country have come from the ranks of the Puritans or the Romanists. Yet the history of the last century may well furnish a warning to the adherents of this theology. Their zeal not being sustained by conflict against antagonistic sects, has double need to be kept alive by purer stimulants. Their mental tendency leads them to make light of differences of opinion; but, if they feel tempted to imagine that Truth itself is a matter of opinion, and belief of no avail, let them learn from history no less than Scripture, that *Faith is the victory that overcometh the world.*

* Hoadly defends (in his 'Reasonableness of Conformity') the practice of signing the Articles without believing them. Hume's correspondence contains his reply to a young clergyman, who had confessed his disbelief in Christianity, and asked the philosopher's advice. Hume recommends him 'to adhere to the ecclesiastical profession in which he may have so good a patron: for civil employment for men of letters can scarcely be found. It is putting too great a respect on the vulgar, and on their superstitions, to purge oneself on sincerity with regard to them. The ecclesiastical profession only adds a little more to the innocent dissimulation without which it is impossible to pass through the world.' (*Burton's Hume*, vol. ii. p. 187.) Scott's 'Force of Truth' is a remarkable autobiography of a man who was ordained on the same principles.

† In 1772, 250 clergymen presented the Fathers' Tavern Petition to Parliament. Its prayer was that the Petitioners might be 'restored' from subscription to the thirty-nine Articles, 'and restored to their rights, as Protestants, of interpreting Scripture for themselves, without being bound by any human explication thereof.' The whole Petition, which is too long to quote here, is the most naive avowal of dishonesty on record, and leaves the modern advocates of a 'non-natural sense' far behind. Paley, in the pamphlet which he published in defence of these Petitioners, acknowledges that they 'continue in the Church without being able to take their belief every proposition imposed upon them by subscription; and speaks of them as 'impatient under the yoke.' (*Paley's collected Works*, p. 382.) This pamphlet was published anonymously at the time, and it is said that when Paley himself was urged to sign the Petition on the ground that he was 'bound in conscience' to do so, he replied that he 'was too poor to keep a conscience.'

(To be continued.)