

ties are perhaps more apparent than real. Certainly no one who had the subject of Christian Unity and Union really at heart, would think of stickling for Uniformity. Nothing of the kind can be found, at the present moment, in any Reformed Church, certainly in none in any English-speaking country. Mr. Hague makes a good point when he says that "all Protestant Churches have what is truly and properly a liturgical worship; that is a worship in a certain recognized order or form, presided over or conducted by a recognized official." This is the exact truth of the matter, and the moment we stand face to face with the truth, all the nonsense about forms and formalism drops to the ground. We all have forms, and the only question worth discussing, or indeed capable of being discussed, is what is the best form, and the most suitable.

We have no doubt that, on the principle of the "survival of the fittest," some such liturgy as the present service of the Church of England would be adopted, in the long run, by most Christian Congregations, not only because it is generally approved by Protestants, but because it represents the traditional worship of the Church for many centuries, and has been purified from all later additions without losing any part of the original Catholic deposit. But no Episcopalian would contend for the universal adoption of the Anglican Prayer Book as a basis of Union. There would, of course, be Churches in which the Prayer Book would be used as it is now; but there might also be congregations in which the services would be very much the same as they now are in Congregational and Presbyterian Churches, whilst in others there might be a union of the two methods, such as indeed we may say we now possess in some English Churches, in which, besides the services appointed in the Prayer Book, others are held of a freer character, with extempore prayer.

Such suggestions may seem a little startling at first, but we believe that many, perhaps most who think a good deal on these subjects, are gradually coming round to this view of the subject. It is not very long since English Churchmen prided themselves on the strict uniformity of their services. Where is it now? When a clergyman goes to officiate in a strange Church, he has to make himself acquainted with the *Use* before he can venture to do anything. "Have you anything before the sermon, a collect simply, or a Collect with the Lord's Prayer (the old universal fashion in parish Churches, and not a bad one) or the Invocation or that?" We are apt to get a little impatient about a number of these unnecessary innovations, and we confess there are some of them not to our taste; but may not these very vanities be providentially allowed and designed to pave the way for a union of Churches in which great diversities in ritual may be sanctioned.

The difficulty about Church and State need hardly be taken into consideration. The only point in which there is the slightest interference by the State with established Churches is in the matter of sanctioning changes in the

law. As regards the interpretation of the law of the Churches, all communions are on the same plan. Every subject has the right to claim the protection of the law of the land; and every Christian community has a right to require that its ministers shall fulfil their contract to teach according to its principles. If Christian Churches had no other difficulties there would be no great hindrance to unity.

On this subject we may remark that Mr. Hague does not appear to state quite exactly the question between Ultramontanes and Gallicans. No doubt they did practically take different views of the relation of the Church to the State; but the essential difference had reference to the relations of the national Churches to the Roman See. We are here, however, dealing only with an *obiter dictum*, which in no way affects the general question.

We have left for final consideration that which is, after all, the great and real difficulty, and which may turn out to be the only difficulty, in the way of Christian reunion, we mean of course the disagreement respecting the ministry and the government of the Church. In a very few lines Mr. Hague puts excellently the limits of this question, and indirectly shows how easy the solution ought to be. He remarks: "Churches of diverse theories approximate in practice. There is much congregationalism in the Episcopal Church. There are officers both in the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches of Canada who are, truly diocesan bishops. Methodism in the United States is wholly episcopal."

When these perfectly sober statements are duly considered, it would certainly appear that there ought to be no difficulty whatsoever about the other communions accepting the episcopal ministry and government. Let it be remarked that such acceptance need commit them to no special theory of apostolic succession. English Churchmen hold any number of varieties of opinion on this subject. Now, does it follow that the universal establishment of episcopacy should lead to anything like tyranny or autocracy. As a matter of simple fact, Anglican bishops have less power in many places than Methodist presidents and superintendents, and as little as Presbyterian moderators. The power of the bishop is a matter to be settled by the councils of the church. Mr. Hague seems to suggest that, in this way, some kind of episcopacy might be accepted by the whole Church.

The concluding suggestions of the paper are very good. First, it is suggested that the ministers of all churches should thoroughly understand the position of others. Secondly, that they should acknowledge each other to be Christians. Thirdly, that all churches should acknowledge each other to be branches of the Church Catholic. If corporate union is to be attained, he points out that great congregational varieties would have to be permitted, as we have also urged. Nothing but good can come from discussions of this kind. If conducted by all Churches, and representatives of Churches in the spirit of Mr. Hague's article, they would certainly hasten forward the consummation so devoutly to be wished.

UNITY IN CHAOS?

THERE is no lack of Charity in rejecting mock unity. Eden will not be recovered by the planting a Fool's Paradise. Fallacies, glosses, and pretence-compromises, which can deceive no thinking mind, are best swept away by a winnowing which, however it searches the heap, yet rejects no grain of true wheat.

With this preface we go on to deal with the 'different uniforms, many regiments, yet one army' fallacy which is popular in the phraseology of so-called 'Evangelical Conferences,' and in the disloyal, after-dinner toasts of English lay Churchmen. Then and there we find the toast given of 'The Bishops and Clergy, and the ministers of other denominations' (an affront and disloyalty to our dear mother, the Church of England, which was denounced in a former comment). The chairman must then endeavour to justify his toast; and a favourite method, for

'Common is the commonplace,
And vacant chaff well meant for grain.'

is to merge the Church and the sects into a chaos host: unity, not 'uniformity': many 'uniforms' in the same army. In our national army have we not many uniforms: those of Guards, Hussars, Lancers, Horse Guards Blue, Rifles, &c.? Then how many different regiments, differing in their weapons, their organizations, their mode of attack and defence, are there in one army! but all, without regard of differences, direct their energies against the common foe. Indeed, those very differences, in detail, of the combined forces, contribute to the strength of the defence, the vigour of the attack. Why require that all should be clothed alike? that all should combat with the same weapons? that all should employ the same tactics? Let the skirmishers scatter, the rifles seek cover, the heavies charge, the engineers throw up entrenchments, the artillery serve the guns, the marines fight by sea, as their brothers by land; what variety, consistent with unanimity, consistent with one end, an end arrived at by means how diverse?

Now does not all this sound plausible? and can we wonder at the acclamation with which it is received?—the

'Clapping hands, and noise
Of crashing glass, and beaten floor.'

Can we wonder at the glee of the many; or, on deeper thought, at the indignation of the few? The building is a showy house of cards, and to the casual eye, substantial; but take just one card from the bottom, and lo! the entire collapse.

As thus. Let us take the case, not uncommon, of a gallant officer of her Majesty's service (an officer in *that* service, at any rate, well versed in the duties of it, both theoretical and practical), thus justifying the toast which we impugn. Let us ask the gallant officer to carry his simile and his reasonings into his own camp. Let him suppose subordination overthrown, and mutiny introduced; the different uniforms not symbolising unity in variety, but having been, in fact, donned as badges of contending and hostile forces. Let him call before his mind a condition of things in which