

the better. Let him select and carry away with him the very wares which he comes to buy. Do not perplex him and distract his attention by pressing upon him that which he does not want. But if general culture is the object, it is surely within well-defined limits only that the elective system can be embraced. A youth of seventeen cannot be trusted to determine what is the best system of culture for the human mind in general or for his own mind in particular. His taste, instead of being his safest guide, is likely to be his most unsafe; it will often turn him away from the very discipline of which he stands most in need. He may have for example a dislike of mathematics, which only proves that it is mathematical training which he specially requires. Left to his own devices he will be apt to flit from one study to another till his course is frittered away. To the despotism of the classics we have finally bidden farewell: nobody now upholds it; some of the most eminent classical scholars advocate the removal of Greek from the curriculum of the English universities. But the university must still take upon itself the responsibility of laying out a certain course or certain courses of culture. It is easy to overrate the importance of special talents and tendencies; they are rather the exception than the rule. The studies selected ought also to be solid and worthy of the effort and expense imposed upon the student and his parents; it is absurd to bring a young man to a University and make him undergo all the risks of residence merely for the purpose of teaching him what he might as well be taught by a French or German master at home. Whether it is worth the while of an ordinary youth to spend four precious years of his life in undergoing a course of general culture is a question which some day will be seriously raised.

AMIDST all these political and military excitements interest in theological questions does not cease. "Enquirer" sends us a tract, in the form of republished letters, on "The Future Destiny of the Unsaved." His theory is "conditional immortality": immortality for those only who have attained spiritual life in Christ, the rest simply ceasing to exist. He thus strikes away the foundation of the doctrine of endless punishment, which is the inherent immortality of the soul. To get rid of the doctrine of endless punishment with its cruelty and the moral difficulties which it entails is in truth the object of all these speculations. We are surprised to find "Enquirer" pleading as his justification for writing in a secular journal the hopelessness of obtaining insertion for his views in any religious newspaper. Among the laity, at all events, the belief in endless punishment is, we should say, growing rare and faint. On this continent the humanitarian spirit of Democracy has had no small influence on theology, and especially on the character of the belief respecting future punishment. The only new Church of any magnitude and importance which the New World has produced is the Universalist Church, which is simply Methodism less the doctrine of eternal punishment, desire of emancipation from which caused the Secession. Nor has Methodism itself remained unmodified. "Enquirer" cites an aged and godly woman of that communion as saying "that these dreadful things are not so often preached about in Methodist pulpits and churches now-a-days, and that she was glad of it." Even American Catholics of the more liberal sort, such as Brownson, seem inclined to discard the horrible torture-house of Dante, and to picture the doom of the lost as simple exclusion from the beatific presence of God. The retention of so dreadful a dogma, merely as a measure of spiritual police to frighten sinners, cannot be seriously advocated by any one. Sinners are frightened—away from church.

AN eminent divine preaching before the Irish Protestant Benevolent Society on St. Patrick's Day dilated on the services done to Christendom by the Papacy. Sweet as the praises of Darius and Xerxes to the descendants of those who had fought at Marathon and Salamis would be the praises of the religion of James the Second to the descendants of those who fought at Derry and Newton Butler. When will it be clearly understood and practically borne in mind that there are two kinds of Irishmen, and that Belfast is not a city of the Catholic Celt? This, however, is not our present point. What we desire here is to recall the distinction, which the preacher seemed rather to leave out of sight, between the Latin Church of the Middle Ages and the Ultramontanism of the present day. The Reformation produced a radical change in the character of Catholicism, which thenceforth became the religion of reaction; of reaction not only ecclesiastical, but political and intellectual also. This was the necessary consequence both of the schism itself, which was followed by a violent recoil, and still more of the secession of the more energetic and progressive races, while the feebler and less independent remained behind. In the Middle Ages the Church was in its way an agency of progress, and deserved, though not without large qualifications, the praises bestowed on it by the

preacher to whom we refer. The change is marked by the appearance of Jesuitism, which has no counterpart in the Mediæval Church. Thomas Aquinas, the typical doctor of the Middle Ages, is no longer the Catholic text-book; he has been superseded by the Spanish Jesuit Suarez; and there is as much difference in spirit between the two teachers as there is between a Mediæval Cathedral and a Jesuit Church with its meretricious art and its sickly incense. The worship of the Pope which forms the badge of the Ultramontanes is a modern growth: the republics of Italy and the national governments of the Middle Ages generally maintained their rights against Papal encroachments, nor did Latin Christendom shrink from deposing a Pope. The Papacy itself in the feudal era, while it often disgraced Christianity by its ambition and its intrigues, indirectly and involuntarily favoured liberty by forming a counterpoise to the tyranny of kings. Let praise be given where praise is due, to the disciples of Loyola themselves so far as they deserve it; but the benefits conferred by Roman Catholicism on civilization belong to the history of the Middle Ages.

SINCE the death of Dean Stanley and the retirement of Dr. Jowett from theology into classics and university administration, the party of Liberal Theologians in the Church of England has been weak. Among its remaining representatives none are more eminent than Mr. Hatch, in whom Canada has special interest, and Mr. Fremantle. Mr. Hatch's volume of Bampton Lectures on the "Organization of the Early Churches" is likely to be a standard work and to rule opinion on the questions with which it deals. He has just been delivering an address at Edinburgh on Progress in Theology, in which he commends to theological students the principles of research of which his lectures are the fruit and illustration. He exhorts to a careful study of the facts which bear upon the history of Christian Ideas and Institutions. No one he thinks has yet examined with anything like the care which scientific research requires the current state of opinion in that Greek world, the elements of which assimilated themselves easily to the new Christian truth, and the modes in which they gave a new form to Christian truth when once they fused with it. The work must be done, Mr. Hatch says, by a number of students, each contributing his share of research. Let the student take some one book, a treatise of Tertullian or Augustine for example, and try to fix the sense of such words as "grace," "mystery," "sacrament." There can be no doubt but the fruits of such investigation would be of a value widely different from the piles of irrelevant antiquities and topographical details with which commentaries on the Scriptures are now overloaded, and which, hashed up with shreds of the Gospel history, furnish forth what are called Lives of Christ; the deluded reader fancying that he is learning something new about the person when he is told some fact of local history, of the local flora, or of costume. Courage, patience or sympathy, according to Mr. Hatch, are the cardinal virtues of the theological inquirer. These are the Liberal Beatitudes: a High Churchman would reverse their order and perhaps omit the first altogether.

MR. FREMANTLE'S Bampton Lectures on the "World as the Subject of Redemption" are an embodiment of the tendency growing among Liberal Theologians to obliterate the distinction between the Church and the world, and to hold that the world converted to Christ and pervaded by Christian principles is the Church. To the Church is left no separate character or function but that of the organ of public worship, while public worship itself is treated as an object no longer paramount, and likely henceforth to decrease in importance. The origin of this theory may perhaps be traced to Arnold, whose ideal was an ancient commonwealth with Christianity instead of heathenism for its animating and informing spirit. From Arnold the theory was inherited by his pupil and biographer, Stanley, who remained a fervent upholder of the State Church, while his doctrinal liberalism shocked and affrighted the clergy. It is needless to say that this identification of the State and the world generally with the Church is a complete reversal of the idea which has hitherto prevailed in Christendom, and runs directly counter to the view of philosophic observers like Comte, who have pronounced the division of the spiritual from the temporal power, inaugurated by Christianity, the most important of all steps in human progress. No part of human life, in Mr. Fremantle's view, is specially sacred, no part is specially profane; politics, science, literature, art, every act and product of humanity, provided the Christian influence be present in the doer or producer, are alike religious. Human life and society ought not to be, nor can they be, cut into halves. Politics, especially as to the rule of mutual rights, are a part of religion. What is the meaning, then, of the words "My kingdom is not of this world"? The meaning according to Mr. Fremantle is, "My kingship does not belong to the present evil state of things, in which empires are built up by fraud or