

her efforts and limit her usefulness, as rather to be an incubus than a blessing. She ought to be able to bring the unchangeable doctrines of Christ home to all sorts and conditions of men, in ways that are the best and most effective; provided always, that those ways are neither evil in practice nor degrading to that Name which we are told to hallow. She ought to be always gathering in the nations, not cutting them off. Uniformity has a tendency, by ever increasing its articles, to drive away; whereas, unity with variety will draw men into the fold, and retain them there when drawn in. Again *uniformity* of the Protestant bodies would be an impossibility. Take the case of public worship. Few of us are silly or uncharitable enough to believe that it is not possible to worship God in public without a liturgy; and I am sure that my brethren who use extemporaneous prayer in the service of their churches would acknowledge that there are those to whom our prayer-book is a channel of true devotion. Neither the liturgical nor the extemporaneous method of worship is perfect; both have their merits; both have their defects. To establish either one or the other in a united church would be at once to cause division. To sanction both would be to complete the unity of prayer, and to keep all that was good and beautiful in the two methods. The unity of Protestantism must then be based, not on sameness of outward form, but on mutual sacrifice in matters non-essential.