

the Tractarian movement, in 1833, breathed into them fresh life, and opened for them a new career.

Following upon this question Dr. Miller said: The High Churchmen and the Evangelicals make up the great majority of the English Church. The members of the Broad Church party are by no means inconsiderable, although relatively small. They include many of our men of thought and science, who can hardly be regarded as a Church party at all. Their influence is rather an intellectual than a spiritual power. But it is widely spread, although in very varied degrees of strength. Let the "High Church party" be fairly and widely interpreted. I use it as drawing a broad line of distinction between High Churchmen and Romanising ritualists. The great body of the High Churchmen are not ritualists in the sense which ritualism must bear to-day. That they disappoint us in too often failing to protest openly and boldly against ritualism—that, when it comes to a struggle, they often throw a shield over ritualists—I wish that we could deny. We cannot. But it would be not only inaccurate, it would be unjust, it would be untrue to identify High Churchmen with Romanisers. All Romanisers may be High Churchmen, but not all High Churchmen are Romanisers. In very many cases they deplore the extravagances and lawlessness of ritualists. I draw this distinction, because it is essential to my purpose. I am not careful to characterise or estimate the spiritual life of extreme ritualism. It is not the Church of England. We disown it. We care not to estimate such life. There may be energy and work; but the mischiefs are so grievous and so fatal that they outweigh incalculably any good effected. But to our High Church brethren it becomes us to do full justice. They hold some few fundamental principles on which we must widely differ from them, and these principles may seem to us to involve, logically and theologically, conclusions and consequences which they honestly repudiate. On some points, and these by no means unimportant, we are not so far apart as we think ourselves to be. These it is not now my duty to discuss. Has the High Church section of our clergy and laity, the great majority of our clergy, that is, and no inconsiderable number among our laity, advanced since 1827 in spiritual life? Surely there is not one among us—there breathes not an Evangelical—so blinded by the narrowness and bigotry of party as not to give thankfully and unhesitatingly an affirmative answer. For it is not because their spiritual life is developed upon somewhat different phases from our own, and presents itself in a somewhat different aspect, and is fostered by a somewhat different process and discipline, and does not find utterance in our phraseology, that we are to deny its reality, or healthiness, or power. Proceeding to speak of the modern Evangelical party, Dr. Miller observed that their fathers would not disown them. Yet he could not speak with unmixed satisfaction of them if he must speak honestly. He said that there is a healthful, vigorous, spiritual life among us—warm love, earnest zeal, saintly men, saintly homes, faithful preaching, self-devoted labour, self-denying liberality—we unhesitatingly and humbly believe. That we have still a strong hold upon the masses of people of all ranks none surely will gainsay. And that our tone of spirituality is as high as it was fifty years ago, or among the worthies of the beginning of the century, that there is as broad a line between us and the world, that the great distinctive doctrines of the Gospel are as clearly and pungently preached or preached with as much unction as by those who went before us, I dare not assert; still less that there is rising up a generation of young men who will grasp the standard as firmly and unfurl it as manfully as those who have gone before them. There are bright exceptions on whom our eyes and hopes are fixed. But forgive me (if ignoring one name in the list) I bid you to run through our Church Missionary Report noting the names of those who have been honoured by preaching the anniversary sermon of that society, and ask whether we see around us the young men who will make up such another list of Evangelical preachers? In one respect the Evangelical clergy as a body have been placed at a disadvantage which yet they must not deplore. It is often said that, as a rule, they are not learned; that by far the greater part of those contributions to

theological literature which will be of lasting value have been from other sources. As a rule—not without its eminent exceptions, such as Dean Goode, Elliott, and our friend near me, Professor Birks—this is true. Why? Were they altogether idle and undistinguished at Oxford, Cambridge, or Dublin? Did they all leave their Alma Mater featherless, as well plucked dunces? Let our class list answer. But the larger number of them were placed—some of them early in clerical life—in vast parishes, or parishes sufficiently exacting to require their whole time and energies. I need but instance—there will be no invidiousness in this—M'Neill at Liverpool, Stowell at Manchester, Close at Cheltenham. These were no light country parishes, no quiet nooks of cloistered ease. Each and all of those whom I have named did something for the Church's literature, but far more for the Church's work. Their Master called them to be evangelists rather than authors. Referring to the great missionary associations, Dr. Miller mentioned that the income of the Society for the propagation of the gospel had risen in the fifty years from £19,305 to £125,294, and that of the Church Missionary Society from £36,972 to £175,835. Of the balance of parties he had not time to speak, but he said that was under God, and speaking of the Church as an Establishment, their great hope seemed to be in the alliance of High Churchmen and Evangelicals, so far as alliance might not involve the compromise of vital principles. Meanwhile (asked the doctor), what are our prospects as Evangelicals, and more especially in reference to candidates for the ministry? Notwithstanding cheering accounts given us, from time to time, from Oxford and Cambridge, I cannot say I think them bright. Very many of our young men have a twist; and a slight twist goes a long way. It is difficult—what rector or vicar does not know it?—despite the great and good service St. John's Divinity Hall is doing—to get Evangelical curates with backbones. There must, to some minds, be narrowness where there is but one way. Our latitudinarians of to-day would have charged St. Paul with narrow-mindedness when he said, "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel . . . let him be accursed." "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name given under heaven whereby we must be saved." God grant us this narrowness to the end! But there is the narrowness of shibboleths, of making men offenders for a word, of branding, or at least suspecting, all who venture to claim liberty in things indifferent. For example, many of us know that the subject of Church music is a very serious practical difficulty. It is a fact (whether we like it or no) that very many of our people prefer a somewhat more florid service than we have hitherto given them. The young are actually driven away to ritualistic churches—I speak from good information—because in many Evangelical congregations the service is cold. No man can be more jealous than I am of the æsthetic element in worship. But we need great wisdom, much prayer for guidance, and a discerning consideration of the circumstances of our own case. We need firm faithfulness to know where to stop, and to stop there. And this is my point. We need brotherly charity, not to insinuate, nor to suspect that a brother is "getting High," and is not a safe man, because (however mistakenly in our judgment) he thinks it his duty to chant the Psalms rather than to drive young people away to hear them chanted in other churches, and withal to hear false doctrine. I have counted the cost of saying even thus much. But I will be honest.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

LONDON.—The solemn season of Lent has passed away, and Easter has shown forth upon churches decorated for the joyful festival with a profusion of flowers, which, whether wild flowers gathered from the woods, or more choice products of conservatories, have in most cases been arranged with consummate skill and taste which seem natural in this æsthetic age.

And it is pleasant now to look back upon the past season, and to think of the great evidence it has given of the spirituality and wondrous vitality which exist in the Church in this country. In all parts of the kingdom Lent has been well

observed, while in London one might have been in church all day long, so many and so frequent were the services held. What will be thought of the following as the programme of services at the parish Church of Kensington for the first four days of Holy Week?

- 7 a.m. Short service for busy people.
- 7.15. Holy Communion.
- 8.00. Morning Prayer.
- 9.15. Children's Service.
- 11.30. Holy Communion—on Wednesday, with Litany and address.
- 5 p.m. Evening Prayer.
- 5.45. Sermon.
- 8.30. Short Service and sermon.

This is in a church which has peculiar advantages to be sure, the Vicar being assisted, if I mistake not, by five curates; nor must it be supposed that the whole of Lent was so active as the Holy Week, nevertheless the Church at large showed that Lent is not an effete institution, but that it, in common with the rest of the Christian seasons is most faithfully observed. One great representative Church is St. Paul's Cathedral. The noble and magnificent pile, standing in the midst of the busiest part of the great metropolis, is the church, not of a parish, but of the whole city. Five services are held in it every week day throughout the year, the first being the celebration of the Holy Communion at 8 a.m. The special novelty for Lent was a mid-day service, at which a sermon or address was delivered by some distinguished preacher, each preacher taking the service for one week. At some of these services a congregation assembled which would have been respectable even for a Sunday evening, nor did this prevent there being a very fair attendance at similar services held in other churches in the city at the same hour. The Dean of Norwich, Dr. Goulbourn, delivered a course of lectures in the Cathedral on Tuesday evenings, the subject being "The Personality of Satan," and the lecture being preceded by a hymn and collect, and followed by the latter part of the communion service, commencing with Psalm 51. Sermons were preached at the afternoon services on Wednesdays and Fridays. The congregation always assembled under the Dome in St. Paul's, and there is something elevating in the sight of so vast a multitude gathered together for worship, particularly when some eminent preacher occupies the pulpit, as on such occasions choir, transepts, nave and aisles, as well as "under the dome" are frequently crowded.

The services at Westminster Abbey, where choir and transepts alone are used, presented no peculiar features during Lent other than a course of sermons at the afternoon services during Holy Week. But the West End Churches in general were unusually active, and in addition to the case of the parish church of Kensington already referred to, mention might be made of the services at St. Peter's, Eaton Square, as presenting something unique. Thus on Sundays a course of sermons was preached by Bishops and other eminent clergymen at 4.30 p.m. Evening Prayer having been said at 3.30, the sermon was preceded simply by a hymn and a collect and followed by the latter part of the Litany as a special intercession of the Church of England in her present trials, while this service was again followed at 8.45 p.m. by a short penitential service. These few instances which might be multiplied to almost any extent will serve to show the manner in which Lent has been observed.

But there is one kind of service which is growing in popularity, and which must not be passed over without notice. Bach's *Passion Music* (St. Matthew) was introduced, or revived at a special service held in the nave of Westminster Abbey some years ago. Since then it has been rendered every year in St. Paul's on one evening during Holy Week, this year not proving an exception; and I believe that the rendering of it on Tuesday night last was exceedingly fine, and was fully appreciated by an immense audience; although St. Paul's is not the best place in the world for such services, the acoustic properties of the building being very bad. But the service was given in some other churches also, and notably in St. Anne's, Soho, where it was rendered every Friday night during Lent, admission only by ticket (without charge), this precaution being found neces-