

appealed to the good sense and feeling of the people of England against such criticism of Miss Nightingale's theology.

And truly it was a sorry affair to raise any question about heterodoxy of belief where there was such evident orthodoxy of life. Why not follow the Saviour's teaching and accept the fruits as the test? When will conventional orthodoxy learn to accept the divine Christianity of Christ, instead of the dogmatic Christianity of its creed? We have seen the question of Miss Nightingale's theology opened on this side of the Atlantic, also, by an incidental statement in one of the New York secular newspapers. The writer, apparently from sufficient knowledge, stated that she was a Unitarian. This was disputed on the grounds that she attended an Episcopal church, and co-operated with Episcopalians in their works of charity—a statement, which, we believe, is correct in both particulars, while the inference sought to be drawn from it, was soon discovered to be unreliable. It did not thence follow that she accepted the three creeds, and the thirty-five articles. It is well known that there are many Unitarian families throughout England and America who worship in congregation with other Christians, in consequence of having no church of their own communion near at hand. This is the case with the Nightingale family. And with regard to co-operating with other Christians in works of charity, Unitarians would be false to all their principles if they declined to do so. In Miss Nightingale's case we find it stated on the authority of positive knowledge that she co-operated in such works with Roman Catholics, both in England and Germany. But we must not hastily infer from this that she belongs to the Pope. The truth is, she belongs